

16 -

A Second REPLY  
In Defence of the TREATISE  
*Mary* OF *Morewood*  
BAPTISM;

(WHEREIN

*M. Baxters More-Proofs*, are found no Proofs.)

In Two Parts.

The First Defending the Antiquities  
against his Charge of Forgery.

The Second Justifying the Charge of slander,  
contradiction, and Popery, against his Writings.

AS ALSO

An Admonition to *M. B.* And some Reflections  
by *Mr Tembs* upon *Mr B's More Proofs*.

With a Rejoynder to *Mr Will's* his *Vindicie*,  
and an Answer to his Appeal.

*Si judicas cognosce, si regnas, jube, Seneca.*

By *H. Danvers.*

Job. 11. 2. Should not the multitude of words be answered?  
and should a man full of talk be justified?

3. Should thy lies make men hold their peace? and when  
thou mockest shall no man make thee ashamed?

L O N D O N.

Printed, for *Francis Smith* at the Elephant and Castle,  
near the Royall Exchange in Cornhil, 1675.

## To the Reader.

**I** Had no sooner finished my defence against M. Wills's his first and furious assault; but was summoned to a fresh encounter by the daring challenge of my old fellow-Soldier Mr Baxter, and whom I presume so to own, because he now seems so contemptuously and ignominiously to treat persons under that character, as though he had quite forgot that he himself had so long acted that part in the Army, and been by word and deed so active in that cause, none more in his capacity in the 3 Nations if we may believe himself; having not only defended it by law, reason, and Scripture against all its opposites; but by zealously engaging and bringing in so many others also into it, as his own words hath it: Encouraged thousands to it, and thought when he was engaged in it he never did God that outward service as then. And was not this a hearty souldier, and Hero indeed? It is true it may be he will now tell you that he has recanted these things, and as lately in his Preface to his Cath. Thol. That at heart he little regarded that Interest, especially as to the civil part of it: ( And is not that wonderful strange? What pray, and preach so many 1000 into it? write, covenant, fight, and engage at that rate for it, and avow that he never did God that outward service as then, and yet no heart to it or for it; if this be not desperate Hypocrisy or Prevarication I know nothing: ) But as to those repentings, Mr Bagshaw has told us from himself how we are to esteem them: repeating that most remarkable passage that Mr Baxter has given us long since about them, viz. That should the change of times make him forget that state that we were fully in, and change his judgment, by losing the sense of what then conduced to its infortion ( which it seems to  
appearance



## To the Reader.

appearance it hath fully done, bespeaking him a great Prophet, to foretell how it would befall him under such like circumstances) this folly and forgetfulness (sayth he) [for so it seems we are to interpret such Tergiversations] would be the way to a sinful and not obedient Repentance, therefore it seems all such repentings and turnings with the time must go for nothing, yea worse then nothing, even sinful and disobedient.

Which things are mentioned for his better remembrance, not doubting but upon the calling to minde some such passages he may (at least others I doubt not will) conceive; that one that has acted at such a rate, and falls so justly under such censure himself, ought to carry it to others with more sobriety and moderation, and with less censure and reflection then he usually doth; and that scornful and contemptuous ill language will neither become souldier, Christian or Minister, much less one that professeth more then any to invite, yea, to conjure all men to love, peace, union, and moderation.

But the matter under consideration before you, is, how the contemned souldier has acquit himself in the contest with this man of might: and which you will best understand by considering his charge, and the defence he makes thereto.

You may remember therefore, that the charge is of 2 parts: First, for Forgery and Prevarication in abusing Antiquity, relating especially to 4. sorts of people, viz. The Donatists, Old Britans, Waldenses, and Wickliff: All which are particularly examined, orderly and fully replyd to, and freed from the pretended Forgery and Prevarication, no such thing being to be proved; and except the oversight of misnaming an Author quoted from Fuller, though the words truly recited, viz. Chocleus for Walden, and mentioning Austins 3d. and 4th. Book against the Donatists for the 4th Book only: And the mistake about Lanifrank to prove Beringarius denyed Infants-Baptism, though fully made good by 2 more, viz. Guit-

To the Reader.

mund & Durandus, not another that I know of in the whole, whereas diverse palpable gross mistakes are apparently made good against him.

Secondly, for injustice done him by changing several contradictions and calumnies upon his writings, which he denies, challenging proof to be made thereof, and which you have particularly and fully done, Proving by clear, and ample demonstration, that he has been for and against Episcopacy, for and against Arminianism; for and against Anabaptism; for and against Tradition, for and against Popery; the last (viz. his being for Popery) to be lamented above all: the other but naturally leading to it. As Dr. Peirce tells him, p. 171. of his Appendix: you have (saith he) vilified the Protestants of every sort, Episcopacy, Presbytery, Independancy, Erastianism, and so make men run into Popery by way of Refuge, and if you fright them from them, you leave them to be nothing but Jews, and Heathens, and I would fain know (saith he) what sort of Christians in the world you have not endeavoured to disgrace at one time or another (professing he knows none.) And as to that of Popery (tells him) that Mr Crandon [viz. a late Presbyterian Minister who wrote that large book against him] had told the world he were a Papist, and one of the worst sort of Papists too, and what the particular Books were that had made him a Papist, and what Emislares he had in all parts of the Land: Which with a friendly Admonition is left to his Conscience and the judicious Reader, with this twofold Lamentation.

First, that a man of those parts and endowments that might be so serviceable to the Church of Christ, should prove so great a troubler and disturber thereof.

Secondly, that notwithstanding his daring and renew'd opposition day by day, not only against the whole Nonconforming party,

## To the Reader.

party, but the Protestant Doctrine and interest it self, that no more hath come forth against him to defend the truth; and that whilst one little Sherlock, is met with by so many Ciceronian Champions, there is yet but one Tully come forth to encounter this great Baxter in his voluminous defiance against the truth; and therefore wonder not if the stones in the street should rise up as witnesses, and babes and sucklings, yea contemptible soldiers should have their Mouths opened in such a cause, against such an enemy and avenger.

That truth may prevail, righteousness, love, and peace kiss each other, and all error and iniquity stop its mouth, is the sincere desire, and shall ever I trust be the hearty endeavour of him, that designs nothing more then to approve himself an affectionate servant to truth and all the friends thereof whilst

Henry Danvers.

---

The

# The CONTENTS.

The First Part defends the Treatise of Baptism against  
Mr. B's charge of forgery.

## C H A P. I.

*Shews his owning 12. if not 13. chapters of the 14. chapters of  
that Book,*

*1st. By confirming the Anabaptists Arguments for believers  
Baptism to p. 18. 2ly. By justifying their Arguments against  
Infants Baptism to p. 33. 3ly. By his eminent witness against  
humane invention and addition to Gods worship. p. 30. &c.*

*What he offers to reconcile his contradiction is fully Answered,  
p. 24. &c.*

## C H A P. II.

*Justifies the witness against Infants Baptism against his Cavils  
and how farr he owes the 14. chapter also.*

*SeCt. 1. Justifies Tertullians witness, p. 33. SeCt. 2. the  
Donatists, p. 35. SeCt. 3. The old Britans. p. 54. SeCt. 4. The  
witness out of the Dutch books of Martyrs. SeCt. 5. The Wal-  
denses. 1st. from their confessions of faith p. 2ly. from their  
leading-men, viz. Beringarius p. 93. Pet. Bruis Henricus and  
Arnoldus, p. 97. &c. 3ly. from the learned writers and de-  
crees of Councils p. 109. Wherein is shewed that the Waldenses  
were called Manichees and why, p. 110. 4ly from the footsteps  
they left hereof in diverse Countrys p. 120. And amongst the  
rest in England amongst the Lollards and Wickliffists and where-  
in Jo. Wick. witnesse is fully justified. p. 121.*

*Mr. B's. notorious abuse of the Waldenses in fathering a Po-  
pish confession upon them, p. 84. His Egregious mistakes about  
Berin-*

## The Contents.

*Beringarius p. 94. His several confident false assertions about the 2d Lateran Council respecting Pet. Bruis p. And his notorious abuse of John Wickliff in many particulars. p. 139. Detected.*

---

The Second Part makes good the charge of slander and Contradiction against Mr. B's writings.

### C H A P. I.

*Proves M. B's slanders against the Anabaptists and Vanists p. 154. The danger and evil of slander ( by his own Rules ) brought home to himself, 188.*

### C H A P. II.

*Detects M. B's manifold Contradictions in his writings, viz. Sect. 1. About Episcopacy, having sometimes been violently against it p. 177. both in its Government in Diocess and parishes, 178. Lyrurgy 178. and 189. &c. Ministry 181. And again zealously for it 183. Rites, Government 183. Service and most disputable Ceremonies, p. 185. Parish-Communion, 187. And eminently for the Liturgy, 189. Severely censuring the dissenters or Non-conformists 192. contradicts himself again therein, 195. Jesuitical Equivocation 195. Mock-repentance, 197.*

*Sect. 2. About Non-conformity, sometimes highly for it, Then a great opposer thereof. 202.*

*Sect. 3. About Arminianism, sometimes an opposer then a great defender thereof. 204.*

*Sect. 4. About the Parliament and their Cause, how 1st he defends then highly censures the same. p. 206.*

*Sect 5. About Tradition, sometimes against then a pleader for it, 207. particularly, 1st. A great opposer of the Tradition of the Creed, 209. 2ly A great defender of the same 213. His notorious absurdity that it was writ by the Apostles 12 years before any Book of the New Testament was writ 236.*

*Sect,*



## The Contents.

*Sect. 6. About Popery, which he hath sometimes violently impugned, 218. And again pleaded for it, viz. For many of the Popish Doctrines, 219. In opposition to the Protestant Doctrines, 222. Many learned men accuse Mr. B. of Popery 223. His Arguments in favour of Popery out of his Cath. Theol. 227. His evil dealing with the book of the Revelations 130. And his deriding those that conscientiously separate from Antichristian pollutions 233.*

*Sect. 7. His 42. Superstitious Popish Assertions, the contrary whereto he calls the sectarys New Commandments about Baptizing Children with the blasphemous chrysms, cringings, Crucifixes, Images, holyness of days, places, persons &c. 240 &c.*

*Sect. 8. His Jesuitical popish Querys about the Translation of the Scripture, and in derogation thereof, answered from his own pen and others &c. 243.*

### CHAP. III.

*Reproves Mr. William Allen for his Groundless complaint against me, and M. B. for abetting the same p. 245.*

### CHAP. IV.

*An Admonition to M. B. 1st. for slander and false accusation 2. Railing ill language 3. Notorious contradictions 4. Adding to & altering Gods worship 5. proud Dictatorship. 6. Forgery and abuse of Authors, 7. abetting others in evil, 8. False worship or Idolatry p. 256. &c.*

---

(1)

The Arguments for Beleevers  
Baptisme confirmed by  
Mr Baxter.

---

CHAP. I.

*Shews, that Mr Baxter hath so far owned  
the book he so scornfully writes against,  
that of the 14. chapters it contains he  
has justified 12 if not 13. of them.*

**D**R. Pierce in his New discoverer tels us,  
that M. Baxter ( from his writings which  
he quotes ) *having confest himself to be guilty of  
pride and prejudice p. 92. And also that a spirit  
of keeness ( or calumny as the Dr sayth ) dwelt in  
him, p. 258. wonders not therefore his writ-  
tings should abound with so much bitterness  
to friend and foe with whom he contended,  
resolving therefore as in his preface not to render  
him evil for evil, nor to vie slanders with such  
a man of tongue, for that as he saith would be but  
to strive who should be most impious.*

Therefore it being as it seems so much the  
temper of the man, his mode of treating me in  
that way of rhetorical rayling and contemptuous  
reviling is no other then the usual measure he  
hath meeted out to his *Antagonists*, and there-  
fore the less to be regarded.

B

But

But inasmuch as he hath proclaymed my book to contain such a *noysom Fardel*, and to be writ with so much *temerity*, and *falsehood*, that a sober *Turk*, and modest *Pagan* might blush to own it.

I have therefore in the first place thought it meet in order to my *just vindication*, to remember him, and to tell the world that that very book he so nauseously contemns, he has himself in words at length, and by good argument, substantially owned and justified, not only in the witness it bears for *believers*, but against *infants Baptism* also, which takes in the whole of the book in all its parts: and to the better discovery thereof I shall first represent you with a brief scheme of the book, and then particularly shew you, that what he hath not grossly abused and falsely fathered upon me in the 14. chapter he hath substantially owned in the other chapters.

That book then you must know consists of 2 parts, the first proving the *Baptism of believers* only in 7. Chapters, the second disproving that of *infants Baptism* in 7. more, of which 14. Chapters, 11. of them are doctrinal viz. deducing and proving each particular from the scripture, upon which the main stress is layd; the other 3. Chapters are historical, demonstrating from antiquity, and humane authority, the truth of believers, and error of *infant Baptism*; and which historical part (as I have said again and again) is not urged for probation but illustration only; and that because

*antiquity*

*Antiquity* hath been so much *boasted* of; it may appear we have something to say for our selves rherein also.

Now that Mr *Baxter* hath of these 14. *chapters*, by words at length, and good arguments subscribed to 12. if not 13. of them is my next work to make manifest, wherein you'l finde the brief contents of each of these 13 chapters, and the owning he gives thereto, annexed to each, and which I beg the readers patience to do, with the arguments more at large from himself then I have yet done, and that for the following reasons.

First, because yet they stand as remark't by us for unanswered arguments from his own pen in full confirmation of ours, in positive contradiction to his own writings, notwithstanding all the provocations he has had from Mr *Tombs*, and my self to reconcile the same, if he can; and being so agreeable to his usual, method of writing, having as Dr. *Peirce* often told him [and made good] in the said book, writ for and against popery, for and against Episcopacy, for and against Presbytery, for and against Independency, for and against Erastianisme, and this abundantly makes good how he has writ for and against Anabaptisme.

Secondly, that it may be seen, and read of all, that much of his barbarous and inhumane dealing with me, is but for saying the same things that himself hath said before in the substance of this controversie; and which I desire

may stand as a monument upon record, betwixt him and me, as a full vindication from his own pen.

Thirdly that with the substance of my book in this Epitomy thus repeated, Mr. B's substantial arguments and full Scripture-authorities confirming the same may be reveiued also, which may be of use to some of his admirers who may be induced to read and consider what he says to the point, when they will slight the same things spoken by others.

And as to the 14<sup>th</sup> Chapter how notoriously he has abused me, himself, and the truth therein, you will have the account in the 2d. Chapter.

---

*The heads of each of those 13. Chapters,  
and Mr. Baxters confirmation thereof,  
here follows in order, viz.*

### C H A P. I.

Treat. of  
Baptism.  
P. 1, 2, 3, 4.

**P**ROVES from the order of Christs *Commission* and *Institution of Baptisme*, Math. 28. 18. 19. that persons are first to be taught in the faith or made disciples or beleivers, and then afterwards to be baptized, and not first baptized and made Disciples after, whereby adult persons capable of instruction are necessarily understood to be the only proper subjects of that ordinance, and not ignorant babes that have no knowledge nor understanding there



( there being but one commission for our one baptism ) *Treat. of Baptism*, p. 1. 2. 3. 4.

In confirmation whereof you have Mr. Baxter thus expressing himself, In his 2. *disputation of right to Sacraments*. p. 149. 150.

Mr B's 2.  
disp. of  
Right to  
Sacramen.  
p. 149, 150.

This saith he speaking of this Text is not like some occasional historical mention of Baptism; but it is the very commission it self of Christ to his Disciples, for preaching and baptizing, and purposely expresseth their several works in their several places and orders.

The first task is to make disciples which are by Mark called beleivers.

The second work is, to baptize them, whereto is annexed the promise of their salvation.

The third work is, to teach them all other things which are after to be learned in the School of Christ.

To contemn this order is to renounce all rules of order, for where can we expect to finde it, if not here, I profess my conscience is fully satisfied from this text, that it is one sort of faith even saving that must go before baptism, and the profession whereof the Minister must expect; but is it possible that an ignorant babe can observe this order and answer this expectation; of which see what is to this purpose cited by Calvin and Piscator: viz. Calvin upon Mat. 3. 6. saith, Therefore that men may rightly offer themselves to baptism, confession of sin, is required, otherwise the whole action is nothing else but sport. Piscator, upon Mark: 1. 4. saith, it is called the Baptism of repentance for remission of sins (because John

## CHAP. II.

Treat. p.  
5. 6.

Proves that the Apostles and disciples of Christ in obedience to this commission did teach repentance and faith as the necessary pre-requisites and qualifications to every one that was to be baptized, *Act. 2. 37. 8. 36. 37. 10. 42. 16. 29. treat. baptism. p. 5. 6.*

Mr B. *ibid.*  
p 55, 56.  
Cc.

To which Mr. Baxter thus assents in the 2. *disput. p. 54. 55. 56. viz. If John Baptist required the profession of true repentance in men before he would baptize them, then so must we, but John did so Mark. 1. 3. 4. Math. 3. 6. and thus Jesus Christ did by preaching repentance prepare men for Baptism, and for his kingdom, as John before, as appears. John 3. 21. John 4. 1. Math. 3. 17. Mark. 1. 15.*

*And to that end he sent his Apostles and other preachers Mark. 6. 12. Act. 17. 30. Lu. 24. 47. That repentance and remission of sins might be preached to all nations in his name, And Baptism which is for the oblation of remission of sins according to Gods appointment comes after repentance, as Act. 2. 37. when the Jews were prickt in their heart ( which was a preparatory repentance ) and said to Peter and the rest of the Apostles, men and bretheren what shall we do, Peter said unto them, repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins.*

So that we must require and expect true evangelical repentance to be professed before Baptism for verse. 41. it is added then, they that gladly received the word were baptized; so that he baptized none that to outward appearance did not gladly receive the word, which could not be without a profession of repentance: and he that persuades them to repent and be baptized, doth in the next chapter v. 19. require them to repent, *See* And as the work of general preaching to the unbelieving world is sometime called a discipling of nations which goeth before baptizing them, preaching of repentance and commanding all men every where to repent *Act.* 17. 30. an opening of mens eyes & turning them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God. vers. 20. And it was the sum of Peters preaching to the unbaptized, repentance towards God and faith towards the Lord Jesus *Act.* 20. 21. So that 'tis apparent, that they took the profession or appearance both of faith and repentance as prerequisite to Baptism.

## CHAP. III.

Evidenceth believers Baptism to be the only Baptism from the example and practise of the primitive saints, *Act.* 8. 12. 18, 8. 22, 14. *Treat.* p. 7. 8. 9. 10.

The truth whereof is most fully and amply Mr B. *ibid.* confirmed by Mr Baxter in his 2d dispute, p. P. 149. &c. 149. &c. thus,

If there can be no example given in scripture of any one that was Baptized without the profession of a saving faith, nor any precept for so doing, then must not we baptize any without it: but the Antecedent is true, therefore so is the consequent, which he thus proves.

1. John required the profession of true repentance before Baptism as before.

2. Christ in his preaching and commission enjoined faith and repentance as a prerequisite thereto.

3. That saving faith was required of the Jewes, is shewed already for Act. 2. 38. 41.

4. The Samaritans believed and were baptized in the name of Jesus Christ Act. 8. 12.

5. Upon no other condition was the Eunuch baptized Act. 8. 37.

6. Paul was baptized after true conversion, Act. 9. 18.

7. The holy ghost fell on the Gentiles before they were baptized, Act. 10. 44.

8. Lydias heart was opened before she was baptized.

9. The example of the Faylor is very full to the resolution of the question in hand. Act. 16. 30. 31. 33. 34.

10. Crispus the chief ruler of the synagogue believed in the Lord with all his house, and many of the Corinthians hearing, believed and were baptized.

11. Those in Act. 19. 5. were baptized after they believed in Jesus Christ, and what all the Churches were supposed to be to whom the Apostle

He wrote, I have shewed before.

In a word I know of no one word in scripture that giveth us the least intimation that ever man was baptized without the profession of a saving faith, or that giveth the least encouragement to baptize any upon any other faith.

#### CHAP. IV.

Maintains believers to be the only subjects of Baptism from the spiritual ends of the ordinance, *viz.* To evidence repentance; figure out present regeneration; to ratify the covenant betwixt God and the believer; to testify a good conscience; to represent the union betwixt Christ and the believers; and to give the due orderly admission into the visible Church. *Treat. of Baptism* p. 11. to p. 26. Treat. p. 11. to 26.

The verity whereof is substantially made good in each particular by Mr Baxter in his 2d disput. p. 56. &c.

1. That the testifying repentance was one great end he thus proves; *If Jesus Christ hath by scriptures, precept and example, directed us to baptize those that profess true repentance and no other, then we must baptize them and no other, but the antecedent is true, so is the consequent which is made good Math. 4. 17. Mark. 1. 16. Act. 17. 30. Lu. 24. 47.* Repentance.

2. That the figuring present regeneration is another, he thus confirms, p. 117. 118. *Christ hath instituted no Baptism but what is to be a sign of* Regeneration.



of present regeneration, therefore he hath instituted no Baptism to be administered but to such; the Major is plain. John 3. 5. Except a man be born of water and the spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God; and so in Titus. 3. 5. where it is called the laver of Regeneration.

To enter  
covenant  
with God

3. To represent the covenant entered into betwixt God and man thereby, which he thus proves, p. 68. That it is the Instituted nature of Baptism, to be in general a professing sign, as well as an engaging sign for the future, that it is essential to it to be significant & obligatory on our part, as well as on Gods part is commonly confessed; for first the minister doth baptize him in the name of the father, son, and holy Ghost; and the party doth consent thereto; as first, by voluntarily offering himself to be so baptized, 2ly voluntarily receiving that Baptism; and his offering of himself hereto goeth before the Ministers baptizing him, and his reception of that Baptism is essential to it: so that Baptism essentially containeth on his part a signal profession of consent to that which is meant in the form used by the Minister, viz. I baptize thee in the name of the father, son, and holy spirit; and that is, that God the father, son and holy spirit be mine and I be theirs in the relations in which they are offered in the gospel to mankind, and which is here sealed, and so a mutual consent, which the signs are instituted by Christ to signifie, Christ offereth himself to be related to me as my Jesus Christ; and by offering my self to be baptized, and by voluntarily receiving of it, I do actually profess my acceptation of his offer

offer that is of himself so offered, and so the father and holy spirit in like manner, so that it is a most clear case, that Baptism as Baptism according to its instituted nature and use, doth contain the persons actual signal profession of present assent to the truth of the Gospel and acceptance of God the Father, son and holy Ghost as therein offered, and it containeth an actual signal profession that we then presently consecrate or devote or dedicate our selves to the Father son and holy spirit in the aforesaid relations.

Secondly, another part of Baptism is the Ministers washing the person, and the person first offering himself to be washed, and after actually receiving, it doth thereby signally profess his consent; now this washing doth essentially signify our washing from our former filth of sin, together with the guilt, our putting away the old man which is corrupt, according to deceitful lusts, &c.

4. The answer of a good conscience another great end of Baptism, he thus confirms. 2d Disput. p. 159. viz. The answer of a good conscience.

If according to the institution, the answer of a good conscience must be joyned with Baptism for the attaining of its end, then must we admit of none that profess not the answer of a good conscience; but the former is certain from the text, for Baptism is said to save, that is its appointed use, yet not the external washing, but the answer of a good conscience doth it; therefore this is the necessary conjunction, & without it Baptism cannot attain its end but it is to be received only in order to the attainment of its end, and therefore never

never in a way by which the end is apparently not attainable, [ but how an infant is capable to be in the exercise of a good conscience herein to the attaining of this end of Baptism will be Mr. Baxters part to discover, if he hath not wholly renounced infants Baptism ].

What the answer of a good conscience is, the common expositors ( as he tells us ) fully confirm, viz. The Assemblies annotations saith, that by the answer of a good conscience we may understand that unfeigned faith whereof they made confession at their Baptism, and whereby their consciences were purified, and received remission of their sins.

And some ( he saith ) understand by the answer of a good conscience, that covenant whereunto they entred at their Baptism, the embracing whereof they testified by their unfeigned confession of their faith.

To hold  
our union  
with  
Christ.

5. Another end of Baptism is to represent a believers union with Christ, which he thus ratifies. 2. disput. p. 98.

If it be the appoynted use of all Christian Baptism to solemnize our marriage with Christ, or to seal or confirm our union with him or ingrafting into him, then must we Baptize none that profess not justifying faith, because this is necessarily prerequisite, and no other can pretend to union, marriage or ingrafting into Christ: both the antecedent and consequence are evident in Gal. 3. 27. 28. 29. for as many of you as have been Baptized into Christ, have put on Christ; ye are all one in Christ Jesus, and if ye be Christs then are ye Abrahams

Abrahams seed, and heires according to promise: here we see that it is an accidental or seperable thing, for Baptism to be our visible entrance into Christ, our putting him on our admittance by solemnization into the state of those children and heires according to the promise, for (as all own) if we be truly baptized we are baptized into Christ, then are we Christs and have put on Christ and are alone in Christ, and Abrahams seed according to promise.

6. That other end of Baptism, of being an orderly entrance into the visible Church, <sup>To admit into the visible Church.</sup> he also maketh good, viz. Plain scripture proof, P. 24.

As a soldier before listing, and a king before Crowning and taking his oath; so are we Church-members before Baptism: but as every one that must be admitted solemnly into the army must be admitted by listing, as the solemn engaging sign, so every one that hath right to be solemnly admitted into the visible Church, must ordinarily be admitted by Baptism; is proved thus.

If we have neither precept nor example in scripture since Christ ordained Baptism of any other way of admitting visible members, but only by Baptism, then, all that must be admitted visible members, must ordinarily be baptized; but since Baptism was instituted (or established) we have no precept or example of admitting visible members any other way (but a constant precept and example for admitting this way, therefore all that must be admitted visible members must be Baptized.

I know

I know not what in shew of reason can be said to this, by those that renounce not scripture, for what man dare go in a way which hath neither precept nor example to warrant it, from a way that hath a full current of both; yet they that will admit members into the visible Church without Baptism do so.

---

 CHAP. V.

2 Treat. p.  
6. 27. 28.

Proves the Baptism of believers to be the only Baptism from the new testament dispensation so different from the old, the Church under the old, consisting of the carnal seed, and wherein the ignorant and ungodly, the impenitent and unbeliever and their seed were esteemed members and subjects of circumcision, and to partake of the carnal ordinances under the law as well as the godly and their seed, whereas the believer and penitent ones, the spiritual seed of *Abraham* were to be reputed the only right subjects of Baptism and members of the gospel Church.

Mr B. 3.  
disput. p.  
303.

In confirmation whereof you have Mr *Baxter* in his 3d dispute. p. 303. expressing himself after this manner, viz. In answer to Mr *Blakes* 7th argument, that the children of notorious ungodly Parents had right to circumcision before Christs Incarnation whereof he mentions *Hezekiah* the son of wicked *Amon*, and *Josiah* the son of wicked *Manasseh*, therefore the children of notorious ungodly parents, have right to Baptism, to which Mr. *Baxter* saith,



It is certain, that the fabrick of the Jewish politie especially the grounds and reasons of all Gods Institutions of those times, are so imperfectly known by us, that it is utterly unfit to reduce so many clear Gospel arguments to one dark one, from those laws: For it is a most certain rule, that in all our disquisitions we must reduce uncertainties to certainties, and not certainties to uncertainties, our arguments must be, notioribus ad minus nota, it being very dangerous, as Mr. Blake confesseth, to argue from meer analogy, and not from the ground of the Institution. And how dark are those grounds in some cases to us?

Yet afterwards in discussing of that question whom must we take for notoriously ungodly? p. 326. Mr. Baxter seems in his criticall way of distinction not only to come about to Mr. Blake, but hath given great advantage to a prophane spirit, and for which Dr Peirce severely reproves him in his *New Discoverer* p. 62. for affirming that to be notoriously ungodly or unsanctified, a man must be guilty of more sin then Peter was in denying and forswearing Christ; of more sin then Lot was, who was drunk two nights together, and committed incest with his own daughters, and a greater sinner then Solomon with his 700. wives and 300 Concubines, and gross Idolotries, when his heart was turned away from the Lord God of Israel.

## C H A P. VI.

Treat. p.  
29.

Proves believers, to be the only subjects of Baptism from the constitution of the primitive Churches, none being admitted in them but such as by baptism were joined thereto, and whereof an account is from most of the Churches mentioned in the new testament.

As to Mr. *Baxters* confirmation of this Chapter, we need only to remember you, how fully he hath already proved, that there is neither precept nor example for any that were baptized in the new testament, but such as made profession of faith and repentance, and that there was neither precept nor example that any were admitted as visible members into the Churches but by baptism; and for instances thereof mentions particularly most of the Churches in the new testament, as before; and which we shall conclude with his citation out of *Calvin*, to which he subscribes, p. 205. viz. *That baptism as received is the seal of our faith as it is the seal of Gods promise, as administred. 2ly. That the constant order is, that baptism follow faith. 3ly. And that it is no better then an impious prophanation of it, if it go without faith; that is faith Mr. Baxter, 1st. if the party seek it without the presence of faith. 2ly. if the pastor administer it without the profession of faith.*

C H A P.

## C H A P. VII.

Proves from antiquity that instruction and Treat. p.  
profession of faith and repentance was necessary 20, &c.  
to precede Baptism, and that the Children of  
Christians had their Baptism deferred till they  
were able to give an account of their own faith.

Which Mr. Baxter fully confirms, by the ac- Mr B's  
count he gives us in his *Saints rest*, c. 8. *sect. 8.* St. Rest;  
*out of Iustin Martyrs 2d. Ap. That the practise of*  
*the saints and Churches in the 2d. Cent. was to*  
*baptize after the profession of faith and repentance.*  
*And which (saith Mr Baxter) is you see no new*  
*way. And that only such as made profession there-*  
*of were then to be baptized, he further instanceth*  
*in his Saints Rest; p. 1. c. 8. Saying, that Tertul-*  
*lian, Origen and Cyprian who lived (as he saith)*  
*in the 2d. and 3d. Cent. do all of them affirm, that*  
*in the primitive times none were baptized without*  
*an expresse covenant, wherein they renounced the*  
*world, the flesh and devil, and engaged themselves*  
*to Christ, and promised to obey him.*

And that children of Christians were not bapti-  
zed till they were able to give an account of their  
faith in those first Cent. he tells us in his *Christi-* Christ. Di-  
*an Direct.* p. 827. affirming that Austin and many rectory p.  
children of Christian parents were baptized at age. 827.  
And in his *Confirmation* p. 26. The constant  
practise of the Church hath given us by infallible  
tradition a full assurance of the order of Baptism,  
and in particular of an expresse profession and cove-  
nant then made, as of any point that by the hands of  
the

18 *The Arguments against Infants-Baptism*

*the Church can be received by us. The 2d. part disproves Infants-Baptism and that it is no ordinance of Jesus Christ, in 7. Chapters.*

CHAP. I.

Treat. p.  
89. &c.

Observes the Scriptures silence about Infants-Baptism with the necessity of Scripture warranty to authorize every ordinance of Christ.

Mr B.  
plain Scri-  
pture. p. 3.

*To which Mr Baxter confesseth in his Plain Scrip. Pr. p. 3. That infants-Baptism is not plainly determined in the Scriptures, and therefore it must needs be a difficult point, and therefore in his defence of the principles of love, speaking in favour of the Anabaptists, saith, that he having had more invitation to study the point thoroughly, and to treat of it largely then most that are offended at them; that they must give me leave to say that he knoweth it to be a very difficult point.*

CHAP. II.

Treat. p.  
87.

Proving that in antiquity there is no authentick testimony for the practise of Infants-Baptism as an ordinance of Christ for 300 years, nor any humane authority enjoying it till 400. years after Christ.

Mr B's  
Defence,  
&c. p. 7.

*Which Mr Baxter thus confirms in his Defence of the principles of love, p. 7. That he knows that in the days of Tertullian, Nazianzen and Austin, men had liberty to be baptized, or to bring their children when and at what age they pleased, and that*

that none were forced against their consciences therein, and that he knew not that our rule or religion is changed, or that we are grown any wiser or better than they. And in his last piece called *More proofs*. p. 188. saith, yet again I will confess that the words of Tetrullian, and Nazianzen, shew, that it was long before all were agreed of the very time, or of the necessity of baptizing infants before any use of reason, in case they were like to live to maturity.

For I am perswaded that the Apostles and first Ministers were so taken up with the converting of Infidels, Jewes and Gentiles, that the case of Infants was so, postponed, and taken but as an appendix to the baptism of the adult, as that it was thought less needfull to give it a particular express mention in the records and history of the Church.

### CHAP. III.

Evidenceth the erroneous grounds both as to fabulous traditions and mistaken Scripture, upon which Infants-Baptism hath been founded. T. p. 132.

As to the ancient Scripture, upon which the Fathers, especially *Austin*, and those after him, & the Papists to this day, so much found infants-Baptism, viz. to save and work grace from Jo. 3. 5. Mr. Baxter doth very much disown in his Animadversions upon Mr. Bedfords Baptizmal Regeneration, and particularly: p. 306. tells us, that Baptism it self is no instrument to effect real grace to the soul of an Infant, nor can work no such cause, because the water is not a subject capable of receiving grace, or of conveying it to the soul, it can-

Mr. B. Animad. p. 106.

20 *The Arguments against Infants-Baptism*

not approach or touch the soul, nor infuse grace in it if it could. And as to several fabulous traditions upon which a stress has been laid, to make it good from Dionysius the Areopagite, Ecclesiast. Hierarchy, Justin Martyrs Responses, he disowns as forged and fabulous, particularly that of Justin Martyrs responses, in his Plain Scripture p. 155. tells us, that the common alledged place in Respons. Qu. 56. ad orthodox. though a place most express for Infants-Baptism, and the book antient, yet it is either spurious or interpolate.

-CHAP. IV.

T. D. 181. Proves that the ordained ceremony of Baptism is in this of Infants altered and changed, and another rite introduced, quite contrary to the signification of the word, nature of the ordinance, and manifest practise thereof, not only in the Apostles times, but many ages after.

Mr. I, 2.  
Dis. p. 70.

Which Mr. Baxter in his 2d disput. p. 76. seems fully to grant, where he tells us; quoad modum, as to the manner, it is commonly confessed by us to the Anabaptists, as our Commentators declare, that in the Apostles times the baptized were dip't over head in the water, and that this signified their profession, both of believing the burial and resurrection of Christ, and of their own presence renouncing the world and flesh, or dying to sin and living to Christ, or rising again to newness of life, or being buried and risen again with Christ, as the Apostle expoundeth in the forecited texts of Col. 3. and Rom. 6. and though we have thought it lawfull to disuse the manner of dipping, and to use less water,



water, yet we presume not to change the use and signification of it.

### CHAP. V.

Discovers several mischiefs, absurdities and contradictions, that are justly to be charged upon the practise. The which Mr. Baxter by substantiall Argument, makes good, and confirms to us. T. p. 310. M. B. Arg

*For if to baptize a person without a profession of faith and repentance, be expressly contrary to Christs Commission, to the Apostles teaching, so the example of all the primitive Saints baptized in scripture, if against all the ends of the ordinance, &c. And a baptism Christ hath not appointed, yea ridiculous, impious, and prophane, as Mr. Baxter hath so fully asserted; then surely to baptize an infant, so incapable, to profess faith and repentance, brings all those absurdities by his own grant upon it; let him avoyd it if he can.*

### CHAP. VI.

Detects the nullity and utter insignificancy of infants Baptism as wanting the right subject-matter, viz. a professed believer, and the due instituted form dipping; as to the truth whereof let all men judge whether Mr. Baxter hath not fully granted, whilst he hath so fully owned, that none but a professed believer that is capable to answer the end of the ordinance is the proper subject thereof, and that sprinkling was not the instituted form, but changed since the first times from dipping. T. p. 315.

B's  
Christian  
Direct. p.  
817.

And the nullity whereof, which if I mistake not he hath substantially owned in this very case which he puts in his *Christian Directory*, p. 817, viz. *Are they really baptized according to the English Liturgy and Canons? where the parent seemeth excluded and those to consent for the Infant which have no power to do it.*

Wherein by his strong objections he makes in the case, and his weak answers thereto, he hath wholly given it up, as I have made appear in the *Treatise* p. 217. to which he hath made no return, and therefore till he do he must not think it much, that we conclude, that he takes is for granted that the Baptism so given is a perfect nullity.

Thus you see how fully in words at length, and by substantial Argument, he hath justified what I have affirmed from Scripture & antiquity, in these 12 or 13 Chapters: both as to proving believers the only subjects of Baptism, as the disproving of infants, as well in the doctrinal as historical part, so that he cannot smite me for the same but he must wound himself.

For 1st, as to the doctrinal or scriptural part have I proved believers the only proper subjects of Baptism, from the order of the commission, the Apostles teaching, the primitive saints practise, the new testament dispensation, the constitution of the primitive Church; and hath not he done the same most amply fully and substantially?

And 2ly. Have I disproved the baptizing of infants from the silence of the Scripture, fabulous,

ious traditions, mistaken grounds and scripture; change of the rite, mischiefs and absurdities, nullity, and insignificancy of such a practise, and hath not he by words at length, and good consequence done the same?

And 2ly, as to the historical part, have I, 1st; from antiquity made good, that profession of faith was in the first ages required before Baptism; and that the children of Christians were not baptized till aged: and hath not he fully done the same by ample testimony from antiquity?

2ly, Have I proved that baptizing of infants was not as a Church ordinance judged necessary for the first 300. years; and hath not he fully done the same?

Therefore for him to render me odious for asserting the same things he himself hath so fully maintained, is just such dealing as Dr *Pierce* observes he meeted out to *Grotius*, as blackening and contemning him for being a Papist, when he himself in his writings appears to be no other, (as the Dr saith) in his pre-advertisement to his *New discoverer*.

*'Tis true I prove him to be a papist by 4. Arguments, but they are arguments only ad hominem, and professedly urged by a prosopopœia, and only in order to his conviction, that more may be said against him, then he can say against Grotius, and that his injuries to Grotius do only prove his own hurts: and having thus proved him to be a papist, I freely profess to believe him none.*

So we may say his words and arguments

*The Arguments for Believers Baptism*

prove him an Anabaptist, he justifying them by these Arguments both in their principles and practise, for which nevertheless he persecutes and reproaches us, which proves him none; So unhappy has he been in his polemical writings.

*Obj.* But I know it will be said that these Arguments taken out of his 2d. *disput.* Dr Tombes and I have injuriously represented and improved against him, contrary to his declared sense and intention, for when he speaks of profession necessary before Baptism he means only in adult persons and not otherwise in Infants, then as the believing parents make the profession for them in their name and stead.

*Ans.* To which it hath again and again been told him that he hath no injury done him (no more then Bishop Morton did the Romanist, to improve the Papists contradictions for the Protestant cause) by so improving his own words and arguments so substantially brought from the Scripture for believers against his slight suggestions and unproved dictates for Infants-Baptism; for though it is true he might mean (as Mr. T. tells him) to beat down Mr. Blakes tenent of baptizing upon a dogmatical faith, yet the middle terms and proofs beats down his own tenet of Infants-Baptism, and directs into the right way of restoring believers Baptism, and so his Arguments prove not only against Mr. Blake for a profession of a justifying faith to every one that is to be baptized, but that that profession, be personal also, as his own Arguments fully evince, and which therefore fully  
 prove

and against Infants confirmed by Mr. B.

29

prove against himself in:bat his imputative profession, or others professing for the baptized.

For instance take 2. or 3. of his Arguments, as first, from the order of Christs commission: If to baptize after the profession faith or being made believers (as he explains it from Mark 16.) is the order that Christ has appointed, then we must baptize such and no other; but so has Christ appointed in his commission; therefore must the minister expect such a profession in every one he baptizeth, otherwise he inverts the order of Christs Commission, doth the thing that is ridiculous, yea impious and prophane, and what anabaptist can say more?

But is not the Baptizing of an Infant from whom the Minister can expect no profession, a contradicting the commission? an inverting the order of Christ therein, that requiring a profession before, and this device of Mr. B. admitting it after.

2ly. From the Apostles doctrine and examples of such they baptized, see how he reasons: If neither precept or example in Scripture be for the baptizing any but upon the profession of faith and repentance, then we must not baptize any without it, but (saith he) we have neither precept or example for the baptizing of any other; the precept he proves from John, Christ, and the Apostles preachings, and the example he gives for the same throughout the new testament, whereof he produceth 111 famous instances, witnessing that none were baptized but upon their personal profession of faith and repentance, and therefore concludes we must baptize none without it.

Which

Which therefore not only destroys Mr *Blakes* notion of baptizing the child upon the profession of a wicked man for it ; but Mr. *Baxters* also upon the profession of a godly man for it : because personal profession was required in every one that was baptized in Scripture, and therefore to baptize any without personal profession of faith, which no child is capable to give, is by his own Argument so without book, that there is no one precept or example for it in all the new Testament.

Thirdly, from the ends of Baptism, wherein he most substantially argues after this manner, as you see, *viz.* *If Christ hath instituted no Baptism but to such who testify a present regeneration wrought in them, whereof Baptism is to be a sign ; and to none but to such as are capable to enter into Covenant with God, by a marriage union with Christ ( which that action lively represents and solemnizeth ) and to none but such as are capable to answer a good Conscience, which is required of every one therein, &c.* then we must baptize such, and none other, and which by sound Scripture Argument he undenyably proves, and that whoever baptizeth other it is none of Christs institution ; whether it is not therefore as manifest that an Infant that is so utterly incapable to perform any of these spiritual ends is not as wholly excluded, though a profession is made for him of a justifying faith by a godly parent : as Mr. *Baxter* ( in his Modell ) excludes Mr. *Blakes* Infant that has only the profession of a dogmatical faith by an ungodly



ungodly Parent for it? and so we might go on with the rest against his Arguments; but let these suffice.

And notwithstanding Mr. T. hath so importunately urged him to reconcile these seeming contradictions, or to renounce his book of *Infants-Baptism* in his *felo de se* writ about 16. years since, and since about 3. years earnestly pres't him thereto by letter also, besides my several Arguments that from time to time I have urged upon him to do the truth and himself right therein; and since by another hand else that has printed some of Mr. B's arguments for believers baptism: and therefore by all hands it has been expected from him.

Yet what at last has been brought forth but some of his old unproved dictates which he would impose upon us as a reconciliation to the contradictions aforesaid: for all that he saith for himself therein, you'll finde in his last book called *More-proofs*, p. 286. where he thus expresseth himself, viz. *But I shall maintain (and I think fully proved) that God so far taketh the childe as if he were a part of the Parent (nature and grace having committed him to his will, and disposal for his good, till he have a will to choose for himself) as that by this sort of faith and consent the Parent is to enter the child into Covenant with God as well as himself, and that in Gods acceptance the Child doth thus truly consent by the believing Parent, and doth Covenant with God as a child covenanteth and consenteth reputatively among-men, who by his Parents is made a party in a contract*

Mr B's insignificant Answer.

contract as in a lease for his life, or the like; not that, in sensu Physico, the person of the child being the same with the Parents, doth consent in his consent, or the like; but that the Parent having the triple interest in the childe of an owner, a governor, and a lover of God by nature and grace, conjunctly alloweth and requireth the parent to dedicate the childe to God, and to consent, that he be a member of Christ and his Church according to his capacity, and by that covenanting consent to oblige the childe to live as a Christian when he cometh to age: and this shall be as acceptable to the child's covenant relation and rights, as if he had done it himself; and in this sence may be sayd reputatively to have consented or covenanted by his parents which in proper speech is, they did it for him at Gods command.

He that is not satisfied with this generall answer, let him either peruse the words themselves in my writings, with those before, and after that explain them (viz. that 2. Disputation) or else if he will do as this man doth, abuse his own understanding and his ignorant readers, by such silly wranglings, animated by partiality, let him bear the consequents, and know that I have somewhat else to do with my few remaining hours, then to write books on such insufficient invitations and expectations.

A rep'y to  
M B's  
Unprov'd  
Dictates.

So that all we are like to have from Mr B. is this, in brief, that a childe reputatively believes, Repents, consents, and openly professeth by his believing parent, and so by consequence hath right to Baptism, and thereby becomes a member of Christ and his Church, the Parents will

will being ( by Gods command ) the child will till he have a will of his own and so to oblige him to be a Christian when he comes to age.

But now the enquiry is , are these Christs words, or Mr B's ? where is the proof of them ? where is the command of God he speaks of ? nay arethey not expressly contrary to Christs words and to M. B's also, as so fully manifested?

And is this new devise of the parents being a M. B's Pa-  
 surety or fide-jussor for his child, any other then <sup>rent and</sup>  
 that of the Gossips, who by the Popes Canons <sup>Popes</sup>  
 was to do the same thing ? *viz.* confess, profess, <sup>Gossip</sup>  
 and renounce, promising and vowing to God <sup>much as</sup>  
 for it, that they would teach it the Lords prayer <sup>one.</sup>  
 and Creed, and see it educated in the Christian  
 faith, only herein the Pope seem'd to have the  
 better, they had 3. Undertakers, of whom the  
 parent was to be none, and the reason was, be-  
 cause he might be an unbeliever, therefore the  
 Church would make a certain provision for its  
 education : but if Mr. B's parent have only a  
 dogmatical faith, or no faith at all, the child  
 must miss of Baptism, and so the Church lose  
 a member, and therefore he knows the Church  
 of *England* doth as little approve of his pro-  
 ject as the Church of *Rome*, who both of them  
 ( as I presume he knows ) do by their Canon  
 law exclude the Parent from being a surety  
 for the child at the Font : and as little foot-  
 steps have we in the Scriptures to make a fa-  
 ther a God-father as in the Canon law : the  
 commission doth not say, Baptize the taught be-  
 lieving penitent parent and his ignorant unbe-  
 lieving

lieving impenitent child, that may have knowledge, repentance, and faith hereafter, if the parent instruct it, and God gave it: no (saith Mr. B.) it inverts the order of the commission to baptize any without Repentance and faith and for any so to do is prophane and impious; therefore this is Mr B. against M. B. in & point blank opposition to Christs institution and in flat contradiction to all the precepts and examples read of in the Scripture, as from his own pen appears, and to the vacating all the holy and spiritual ends of that great ordinance.

And therefore whether by the same rule he dictates for us here in this ordinance, we ought not to take his word in all other ordinances and all parts of worship also, and so embraced M. B. and turn Christ and Scripture out of doors? for if we leave the Scripture rule in one may we not also in another, and so reproach the wisdom and authority of Christ in all appointments?

Mr B's  
must re-  
markable  
self con-  
demnation.

But what such men deserve, that shall dare to be so impudently proud and arrogantly presumptuous to mend or alter Christs appointments, let Mr B. himself be the judge, who hath spoken so like an oracle in his 5. Disputar. about Church Government, p. 468, &c. that what he hath therein sayd deserves to be written in letters of gold, viz. *If it belong to scripture sufficiency to be the full Revelation of the will of God concerning ordinances of worship and duties of universal necessity, then must we not imagine that any such are left out; if Scripture be Gods law it is a perfect law. And when men dare think themselves wise*

enough to amend the holy Scripture is not this exceeding pride? how can man more arrogantly lift up himself then by pretending himself to be wiser then his maker and redeemer? Is it not bad enough to equalize your self with him, unless you exalt your self above him? if you do not so, what mean you by coming after to correct his laws, and mend his work, and make better laws and ordinances for his Church then he himself hath done?

And by this means we shall be brought to a loss for the rule of our Religion, for if once we leave the holy Scriptures we shall not know where to fix, if God hath not instituted all the ordinances of worship (such as sacramental and myſterial rites, &c.) that are meet to be ſtatedly impoſed on the Churches, then we are uncertain who is to be the inſtitutor of them, the Pope will claim it, and General Councells will claim it, and Provincial Councells will claim it and Princes will claim it [and may we not ſay our great dictator Mr B. will claim it.] and we ſhall be at a loſs for our Religion.

And whoever he be that will be the maſter of our Religion, they will certainly be men, and ſo it will become a human thing, whereas divine worſhip ſuppoſeth a divine inſtitution, and it is an act of obedience to God; & therefore ſuppoſeth a law of God; for without a divine law there cannot be obedience to God.

And impositions of man ſeem to be plain violations of thoſe prohibitions of God, in which we are forbidden to add to his worſhip or diminiſh from it; as Dent. 12. 32, what thing ſoever I command you, obſerve to do it; thou ſhalt not adde thereto, nor diminiſh from it. Obj. But we adde nothing



thing to the word of God though we impose some mystical rites and service as he imposeth not [ such as Infants-Baptism by the imputative faith and profession of Parents. ] Answer: The text doth not say, thou shalt not adde to my command, but thou shalt not adde to the thing that I command thee; it is the work, worship or ordinance that you are forbidden to adde to or diminish from, and not the word or law it self only: as when Christ in his commission sayth, *Teach and baptize the believer* [ to adde, and their Infants also who are to be baptized first, and taught after. ]

Thus I have gone through 13. of my 14. Chapters, and made them good, I doubt not from Mr. B's own words, and that being performed the controversy betwixt him and me is undoubtedly ended, being so fully given up in both parts of it, both as to Scriptures and antiquity: For though the 14th. Chapter doth comprehend particular witnesses against Infants-Baptism, yet those testimonies that are produced from Mr. B. out of antiquity, to prove only for adult Baptism in the first ages, and that Infants-Baptism was not judged necessary, are substantial witnesses against it, should no more have been produced, and that I had been mistaken in those that I mention in the 14th Chapter.

But I doubt not therein also to acquit my self, and to make good that, as well as the other parts of my book, and thereby discover Mr. B's. most injurious and unrighteous dealing with me, and the truth, to his just rebuke and shame of face.



## CHAP. II.

*Wherein the witnesses against Infants-Baptism are justified against Mr Baxters Calumnies.*

## Section I.

*Tertullians Witnesse justified.*

**T**He first witness he opposeth is that of *Tertullian* my first witness; to justify whose witness denyall of Infants Baptism as an ordinance of Christ I have produced a 7-fold Argument, and the concurring Testimony of diverse learned men, viz. *Iliricus* and his companions, *Beatus Rhenanus*, *Sculetus*, *Daille*, and *Dr. Barlow*, who concluded, that he denied Infants Baptism as unwarrantable and Irrationall.

To which *Mr. Baxter* in substance saith these two things, first, that it appears by *Tertullians* opposing it, that it was *de facto* in use, and that some did practise it in that century, thereby contradicting my self, in affirming that it doth not appear to have been practised, till the following century; and demands why that has not been answered? Secondly, that what *Tertullian* spoke about the matter, it was only in point of conveniency, about deferring of Baptism in Children and others also, but concludes not against baptizing of Infants, being himself for it, in case of danger of death.

D

To

To both which in my answer to Mr. *Wills*, I have largely spoke, though Mr. *Baxter* is pleased to overlook it, and not at all to regard what I have said.

Having as to the first affirmed with Dr. *Barlow*, that the notion of the thing as urged from divine authority, came into the world before the practise of it; the arguments about which are thus early ( in its first appearance ) and most substantially refuted by this great Doctor *Tertullian*; not only as to the mistaken Scripture then and ever since pretended for it, viz. *suffer little children to come to me, &c.* but also the utter incapacity of Children, or any but grown persons, to perform that great ordinance aright; the folly of Witnesses so unwarrantably to undertake for children, the great *Basis* upon which afterwards it was built, the danger of prophaning an ordinance of Christ, the insignificancy of the ends pretended to take away sin; which was a witness with a witness, striking at the root and foundation of all the pretensions to it, as more at large is there shewed.

And as to *Tertullian's* being nevertheless for it, it is an utter mistake, as I have demonstrated, who was only, upon the superstitious conceit then it seems fancied: for the baptizing of dying persons, as some were in after times when *Austin* caused his dying distracted friend to be baptized, *Tom. 7. Col. 89. Amicus quidam Augustinus etiam ne scire baptizatur: Protogenes* also caused sick children, to be baptized for their health, as before. But what is this to the baptizing

zing of children, as an ordinance of Christ, to admit them into the Church, and the priviledges thereof, the thing pretended to and pleaded for?

And therefore, Is not Mr. *Baxter* worthy of blame to pretend to answer books, and take no more regard to what is said by his opposite? which when he or any body else replies to; respecting what hath been said to this witness, they may expect an Answer; but in the mean time let what hath been said suffice:

## SECT. II.

*The Donatists witness, justified.*

The next witness he contradicts, is that of the *Donatists*, (and which he doth with great contempt, ignominy and reproach); concerning whose denying Infants Baptism, I have first, from antiquity produced *Austins* writings, (there being little else to be found concerning them but what is reported by their greatest enemies, as I have observed) viz. In those his Arguments for Infants Baptism, in that his book of *Baptism* against the *Donatists*, as also to *Vincentius Victor* a leading man amongst them.

The *Donatists* witness justified.

Secondly, from the concurrent testimony of several modern authors, viz. *Walden*, *Viccomes*, *Fuller*, *Frank*, *Twisk*, especially *Spanhemius*, who so positively affirms from *Austins* writings, and from the decree of the *Milevian Council*, that they did positively deny Infants Baptism.

To which Mr. *Baxter* opposeth himself with bitter rage, affirming, that I have belyed *Austin*, belyed *Vincentius Victor*, and denies that the

Modern Authors have spoken any thing to such purpose, whose words are these, p. 241. viz. *Mr. Bagshaw is quite overdone in the quality of untruths: Reader, either this man had seen and read the book of Ausin mentioned by him, or he had not: if not, doth he use Gods Church, and the Souls of poor Ignorant people with any tenderness of Conscience, sobriety, or humanity, to talk at this rate, of books that he never saw or read, which are so common amongst us to be seen? If he understands not Latine, how unfit is he to give us the History of these Antiquities, and how audacious to talk thus of what he knoweth not? If he understand it, what cruelty is it to the Church, to venture on such untruths to save him the labour of opening and reading the books he talks of? But if he hath read them, then I can scarce match him again amongst all the falsifiers that I know of in the world. I dare not be so uncharitable to him, as to think that ever he read them.*

To which I say first, As to that unhandson infinnation and vile reflection upon that worthy confessor deceased, whom he could not be content so to abuse living, and immediatly also after his death, but must still thus unworthily trample upon his ashes; I doubt not but since he thus ranks us together, and makes me so much to outdo him, that the discovery of the measure he metes out to me herein, may be some vindication of that eminent Worthy also, he so often in his book vilifies, whose memory will live and be of precious savour amongst the just, whilst others will rot and perish.

But

But to the matter of my own reproach: in the first place, to put Mr. *Baxter* out of doubt, he must know, that before I put down these Quotations out of *Austin*, I did read them, and have yet so much Latine left after 30. years discontinuance from the University, as to understand (as I conceive) what I read therein, and therefore I shall put it to the tryall whether I be such a falsifyer as is not to be matched in the world: And if the great *Jansenius* who read *Austins* works 30. times over, did so mistake him, as Mr. *B.* in his late *Catholick Theology* tells us, it may not be so wondred at, if I should mistake him also.

That *Austin* did in his book of Baptism against the *Donatists* write diverse Arguments for Infants Baptism, from supposed Antiquity before; universal consent, (as he says) of the Church then, as well as by Arguments from the Scriptures, particularly from the Analogy that Baptism might have with circumcision, to save the Infants: and from *John. 3. 5.* | o be baptized or born of water for salvation, Mr. *Baxter* cannot deny, and therefore I shall not need to produce the words; but upon what grounds he denies it to be properly urged, we shall discourse afterwards.

And that I read also what *Austin* wrote to *Vincentius Victor*, in the quotation mentioned. *Lib. 3. de anima Ch. 13. 14.* concerning his denying Infants Baptism (as the denying of Infants Baptism went in those days) viz. that Children might be saved without it, though Mr. *Baxter*

saith, there is not a word of truth in it; there being no such matter in that Chapter or the whole booke: let the following words of *Austin* vindicate me *Tom. 7. p. 1284.* Tu autem, & originalis peccati reos parvulos confiteri, & tamen eos sine lavacro Regenerationis absolvis & in paradisum mittis, & postea etiam Regnum cœlorum intrare: But thou who acknowledges that Children are guilty of Original sin (which it seems the Donatists did) yet without Baptism absolves them and permits them to go into paradise, and afterwards into the kingdom of Heaven: *Hæc multum aperteque perversa & fidei catholica adversa, &c.* Which manifestly appears to be perverse and against the Catholick faith: And therefore in another place tells him that he thereby did contemn what is said, *Joh. 3. 5.* He that is not born of water and the Spirit shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven, writing also his whole booke to *Rematus* against him for this Doctrine.

And therefore it is that *Walden* in so many places (who charges *Wickliff* with the same doctrine) doth so accuse him by several quotations out of *Austin*, and particulary *Tom. 2. Ch. 101. fol. 104.* *Audax Vincentius concedit parvulos trahere primævum delictum; sed, si non Sacramentaliter Baptizantur, intrauros in regnum Cœlorum &c.* Audacious Vincent, acknowledgeth, that Infants are guilty of Original sin, but, though not Sacramentally baptized, to enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whom he Judges and condemns for the same 20. times in the said Booke.

And



And therefore it is, that *Viccomes* in the Catalogue of those that denied Infants Baptism [*Baptismus parvulorum qui negarunt,*] ranks *Vincentius victor* the Donatist, apud *St. August. Vincentium victorem de Anima*, l. 3. ch. 14.

And that his brethren the Donatists were one with him herein, Dr *Fredrick Spanhemius*, no friend (as is well known) to the Anabaptists, doth in his book which in English is intituled, *Englands Warning*, ch. 4. p. 48. speaking of the erroneous opinions of the Anabaptists, sayth, *That with the Donatists, Eunomians, and other Hereticks they do condemn childrens Baptism.* And quotes *Austin contra Donatistas*, and the 2d. Canon of the Council of *Milevitan* to make it good: and that with the *Catharists* and *Donatists* they will not have the *Lords Supper* administred but to pure ones.

Besides the concurring Testimony of so many other Authors, viz. *Bullenger*, *Fuller*, *Twisk*, *Franke*, &c.

Therefore you see I am neither so gross a forger, nor so notorious a falsifyer, as Mr *Baxter* would render me, having faithfully given you my Authorities for the same; *valeant quantum valere possunt*, Let them signify what they will:

Obj. But 'tis urged as the grand objection against this, *That suppose the Donatists did with Vincentius Victor affirm, that Infants that were not sacramentally baptized might be saved, what is that to their denying Infants Baptism, the thing affirmed from it?* For who almost amongst the Protestants that own Infants Baptism, but do affirm

the same thing? must it therefore be fathered upon them that they deny it also?

Answer. It is true, that many of our Protestants may and do affirm now, that children may be saved who die unbaptized, and yet not be deniers, but may be, and are, owners and practisers of Infants Baptism: but this is no reason that they who so affirmed formerly, might and did so also: Because Infants Baptism was held then upon clear other grounds, and to other ends than now.

Upon  
what  
ground, In-  
fants Bap-  
tism was  
formerly  
asserted  
and practi-  
sed.

The principal and chief ground upon which it was asserted and imposed in *Austins* time, was, To save the Infant, and that without it an Infant could not be saved, and that whoever denied Infants salvation by it, were therefore as deniers of Infants Baptism to be Anathematized; and the chief scripture urged for the same was, *Joh. 3. 5. Except a man be born of water* ( which was Baptismal water as they concluded ) *he should not enter into the kingdom of Heaven.* In proof whereof I could give you diverse quotations out of *Austin*, but let one suffice for all; in his book *de fide ad Petrum. ch. 27. Firmissime tene & nullatenus dubites; non solum homines jam ratione utentes verum etiam parvulos qui, sive in utris matrum vivere incipiant & ibi moriuntur sive jam de matribus nati sine sacramento sancti baptismatis quod datur in nomine patris, & filii & spiritus sancti, de hoc seculo transeunt, ignis aeterni sempiterno supplicio puniendos quia etsi peccatum propria actionis nullum habuerint, originalis peccati damnationem carnali conceptione & natiuitate*

traxerunt: & siquem contrarium his dogmatizare cognoveris tanquam pestem fuge & tanquam hereticum abjice & inimicum fidei Christiana, atq; ex omnibus Catholicis Anathematizandum. Firmly do thou hold, and by no means doubt, that not only men that are come to the use of reason, but also children whether beginning to live in their mothers womb, and there dying, or, being newly born of their Mothers, dye without the holy Sacrament of Baptism, which is given In the name of the father son and holy spirit, do go into everlasting fire, eternally to be punished; because though they have no actual sin of their own, yet they have the guilt of Original sin, through the carnal conception in their nativity: and if thou knowest any to teach contrary hereto, shun him as the Plague, and reject him as a Heretick, and, as an enemy to the Christian faith, let him be excommunicated by all Catholick Christians. And in pursuance of this doctrine, there were several Canons in several Councils made, to Anathematize any that should deny Baptism to little ones for their salvation, which you may reade in the *Treat. of Baptism*, p. 106. 107. We shall only mention that 2d. Canon, of the 2d. Milevitan Council, which Spanhemius observes was made purposely against the Donatists, who granted, that children had Original sin, but affirmed they might be saved without Baptism. \* Item placuit, ut si quis dicit \* Concil. ideo dixisse Dominum, In domo patris mei mansiones Affri. multe, sane ut intelligatur, quia in Regno celorum Anno erit aliquis medius aut ullus alicubi locus ubi beati Christ. 424. ex collectio vivant parvuli, qui sine baptismo ex hac vita migrarunt Regia.

*grarunt, sine quo in Regno cœlorum, quod est vita æterna, intrare, non possunt, Anathema sit. Nam cum dominus dicit, Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua & spiritu sancto non intrabit in Regnum cœlorum: quis Catholicus dubitet participem fore diabolici qui coheres esse non meruit Christi? qui enim dextra caret sinistram procul dubio partem incurret.*

And in the 5th. General Councell of Carthage, it was decreed in these words, *We will, that whoever denie that little Children by Baptism are freed from perdition and Eternally saved, that they be accursed.* And that these Canons respected the Donatists is clear, because they owned Children had original sin, but said, they might be saved without Baptism: but the Pelagians denied them to have Original sin, but said, they might be baptized to enter into the kingdome of Heaven: as saith Austin, *Tom. 7. Ep. ad Bonifac: p. 878, Parvulis videlicet Baptismum necessarium, non propter remissionem peccatorum sed tantummodo propter regnum Cœlorum.* So that you see whoever affirmed, that Children might be saved without Baptism, denied the principall ground for the which they were to be baptized in those days.

The Fathers denied a federal right to be a ground to baptize Infants upon.

For we read of no such thing as a federal holiness to intitle them to salvation or qualify them for Baptism, which hath been since set a foot from *Gen. 17. 7.*

*Circumcision being denied by the fathers to be a seal of the righteousness of faith to any but to Abraham the father of all: It being only a signe as they said to the Jewes that they were Abrahams seed,*  
but

but not a seal of the righteousness of faith, as all the Jewes also were not the fathers of many nations: as Chrysostom and Theophylact. *Treat. of Baptism* p. 171.

*Obj.* But do not the fathers reason from Circumcision for Infants Baptism, as *Cyprian, Nazianzen, Austin, &c?* and doth it not betray the Anabaptists ignorance, as saith Mr. *Wills* to deny that the Ancients founded the practice upon Scripture-Arguments?

*Ans.* It is true, they do reason for Infants-Baptism from the analogy that it ought to hold with Circumcision, but how? not as the Protestants argue from the Covenant, but from a mistaken apprehension, concluding that as Circumcision was appointed to take away Originall sin, so saith *Cyprians Epistle. Ambros. de Abraham. c. 11. &c.* and to save them also, as saith *Austin. Tom. 7. lib. 4. c. 24. contra Donatistas.*

That therefore Baptism was appointed to that very end for Infants, to take away Originall guilt, and to save them, and to that end it must therefore be applyed to all, both the Children of the bad as well as of the good, if they brought them to it: because the Children of wicked *Ammon* and *Manasseh* were to be circumcised as well as those of *Hezekiah* and *Josiah*, and that reprobate *Esaue* and *Ishmael*, being circumcised as well as elect *Isaac* and *Jacob*; That Baptism should be administred without any respect to fæderal holinesse: and therefore saith *Austin* in his book *de Peccat. Merit. l. 1. c. 28.* Infants are therefore to be baptiz'd for the remission of sins, that in Re-  
gene-



generation they may be cleansed from that filth they had contracted in generation: Upon which words of Austin, Bishop Davenant in his Ep. p. 12. saith, *Neque hic Electorum aut non Electorum discrimen ullum admittitur, &c.* Neither did they admit of the distinction of the Elect or not Elect, as to the partaking of the benefit of Baptism, mentioning to that purpose a clause out of one of the Synodical Epistles, That Esau himself was freed from Originall sin in his receiving the Sacrament of Circumcision. Esau, *accepto sacramento, reatu peccati Originis caruit.*

Federall  
holinesse  
not own-  
ed by the  
Fathers as  
a ground  
to baptize  
Infants  
upon.

The great Argument now for fæderal holinesse from the 1 Cor. 7. 14. to qualify for Baptism, is not owned by the Ancients. Jerom saith, *Because of Gods appointment, marriage is holy.* Ambrose, *that the Children are holy because they are born of lawfull marriage.*

Austin in lib. 3. c. 15. de Bapt. parvulorum: *Illud sine dubitatione tenendum est; quacunque illa sanctificatio est, &c.* It is to be held without doubting, whatsoever that sanctification was, it was not of power to make Christians, or remit sins, &c. for nothing could do that but the Act of Baptism as to Children: and in his book de verb. Apost. c. 24. The question being, whether the Children of the Baptized Christians were holy, he saith, not, because as the Circumcised beget only the uncircumcised, so neither did the Baptized beget Baptized ones, or holy or regenerate ones, for the terms were equivalent, and the reason he gives, is this, *Quia nemo renatus antequam natus, None is new born before he is born.* And gives two il-  
lustra-



lustrations to prove it, viz. 1. that the purest wheat, that is most purged from chaff and husk, yet being sowed, brings forth grain that has chaff and husk; and the best grapes that are sown bring forth wilde grapes.

Neither did the Ancients esteeme the children of the faithful Church-members or disciples, or believers, by which they had right to Baptism as Mr Baxter, and many others affirm, for *Austin* in his 66. Epistle to *Dard.* saith, that those that go to make Infants Disciples, do not only lose their pains, but expose themselves to laughter.

The Ancients esteemed no Children to be disciples so as to intitle them to Baptism.

And that they are not otherwise believers than by Baptism, wherein they have life given them, and are related to Christ. *Lib. de Bap. parv. c. 30. Qui habet filium habet vitam, qui non habet filium non habet vitam: non igitur solum Regnum calorum sed nec vitam, parvuli habebunt si filium non habebunt; quem nisi per Baptismum ejus habere non possunt; He that hath the son hath life, he that hath not the son hath not life. And therefore children neither have the kingdom of heaven nor life if they have not the Son, whom if they partake not of Baptism, nither can they have.*

And therefore in his book *de fide ad Pet. c. 40.* That children who cannot by themselves believe nor are not capable to testify repentance for their Original sin, by the Sacrament of faith and repentance, which is holy Baptism, they have both for their Salvation.

And in another place though they have neither reason, capacity or understanding of themselves, yet our holy Mother the Church lends them ears, feet,

feet; and tongues; whereby they profess faith, confess, and renounce the Devil. And to that end *Walden. Tom. 1. de Sacram. Fel. 107.* That there is to be three Sureties; one for each person in the Trinity to undertake for the childe.

Tradition  
the principal  
Authority for  
Infants  
Baptism a-  
mongst  
the Anci-  
ents.

Yet when they have said all they can from old Testament-analogy and Scripture-allusion, *Augustin* in his 10th. Book *de Gen. c. 23.* sayth, *That Infants Baptism is not otherwise to be believed but as it was an Apostolical Tradition. Nec omnino credenda est, nisi Apostolica esset, Traditio.* Which notwithstanding many of our Protestant *Pedobaptists* disown, pretending rather scripture-Authority for the same. Thus you see upon what different grounds the Fathers and those in latter times have asserted Infants Baptism, not only upon different Scriptures but to different ends; and therefore you see hereby the reason why that which went for denying Infants Baptism formerly, may now well consist with the practising of it by the new grounds since taken up.

But you'll say, When was it that these old Arguments were given up of baptizing children for their salvation, to take away original sin, to regenerate them, and to make them members of Christ; *ex opere operato*, by the deed done? And when did the new Arguments upon Federal right from *Gen. 17. 7. 1 Cor. 7. 14.* and the seed of believers Infants Church membership and discipleship, as the seed of believers, giving them right to Baptism, come in?

To which I say, I have already given you some account in the Treat. of Baptism p. 159. *viz.*

That

That the first writer of note that gives us any of these new Arguments, as Mr Tombes that great searcher into this controversy informs us, was *Zwinglius* about 120. years since; and that he went a new way, his own words in the beginning of his book of Baptism imports, which are these, viz. *Tom.2.57. Illud mihi ingenue circa libri initium dicendum est: fere omnes eos quotquot ab ipsis Apostolorum temporibus, de Baptismo scribere instituerunt, non in paucis (quod pace omnium hominum dictum esse velim) à scopo aberravisse, that is, In the beginning of my book (sayth he) I must ingenuously profess, that almost all those that have undertaken to write of Baptism even from the very times of the Apostles have (which I desire may be spoken with the favour of all) not in a few things erred from the scope (or true scripture-sence): who doth therefore in his said book manage the Arguments of Infants Baptism from Fæderal right; for when the unsoundness and rottenness of that ancient ground did appear to those Reformers that turned from other parts of Popery, they being loath to part with this Tradition, endeavoured to build it upon this new foundation; for when it was discovered that Infants might be saved without Baptism, and that they were not damned if they dyed without it; and that the Sacrament did not give grace by the bare work done, nor took not away Original sin, nor that Gossips were any appointment of Christ; It was high time to lay a new Foundation for it, or else it would have*

have fallen: therefore is this new way of *Covenant-holyness* found out, which is not above 150 years since, for *Zwinglius* wrote his book of Baptism about 1525.

And that this is the new way appeareth, because the Papists as it is well known kept *Austins* way all along, and so continue to do to this very day, and to that degree that they (as *Austin* and those Councils served the *Donatists*) have served those that go this new way, who deny Infants to be baptized for salvation.

The *Lollards* pleaded Infants *Covenant-holyness* against their Baptism.

Neither do we finde amongst the *Waldenses*, *Lollards*, or *Wickliffists* the great impugnors of popery, one word to favour this new way of *federal Covenant-holyness* to baptize Infants upon, in any of their Ancient writings or confessions, but the contrary, as we have and shall further make appear. And particularly we finde in them, as *Walden. Tom. 3. fol. 118.* that the *Lollards* and *Wickliffists*, both in *Scotland* and *England*, were so far from bringing this new Argument from *covenant-holyness* for Infants-baptism that they improved it to the quite contrary, pleading that therefore they should not be baptized, his words are these: *Quod factus à fidelibus propagatus non sit sacramentaliter Baptizandus imo parvulis dixerunt inutiliter baptismum conferri.* And that they were holy, they produced that text, *1 Cor. 7. 14.* (though mistakenly) to prove it.

And which very tenet we finde held by those *Lollards* also taken at *Colchester* and burnt after at *Norwich*, Anno. 1428. who asserted that the Children

Children of baptized believers needed not to be baptized; and that if they dyed without Baptism, they might be saved. Fox, Martyr vol. i. p. 867. 868. And further Walden tells us that the Wickliffists did in his day reason with them, that, if Children might be baptized by the faith of others, they might also be saved by the faith of others; and therefore it was needless to baptize them for Salvation. Walden. Tom. 2. fol. And that the Novatians were the same with the Donatists, I no ways doubt, from the reasons before expressed, and to which I shall add what I meet with in *Gabriel Præcolus, de vit. sect.* concerning the Novatians, p. 123. viz. That they affirmed, that Infants did not stand in need of Baptism, *Infantes non egere Baptismo.*

To the clearing of which, I have been the larger, not only to make this point of the Donatists more manifest, but, more fully to evidence, what we have to say, respecting our other Witnesses in this particular.

*Object.* But Mr B. tells us, that *Anstins* Arguments in his Book against the Donatists for Infants Baptism, mentioned by me, are rather so many Arguments they held it, than that they denyed it; because he therein urgeth Arguments from the tenet of the Universal Church, & every Christian for it.

*Ans.* To which I say: that, if this be Mr. Baxters chiefest ground (as indeed it is) why he concludes me such a notorious falsifyer, I appeal to the judicious Reader, whether it be not very hard measure to be so severely dealt with, upon no better demonstration than upon his single apprehension, and no better proved; and I



appeal to Mr. *Baxter*, whether, if I should deal so with him, I should not render my self both immodest and unchristian therein.

But to his proof: *I am the most notorious falsifier in the world.* Because I affirm *Austin* contended against the *Donatists*, for denying Infants Baptism in those Arguments in the 4th. Book. 24 Chapter. whereas therein (as he saith) *Austin* affirms the quite contrary, viz. that the *Donatists* did own it, and the reason is, because he affirms, that none of the universal Church disowned it then or at any other time, nor that any Christian disowned it. But the *Donatists* he consents to be of the universal Church, and Christians also, therefore this serves only to prove that they did not deny it.

Now it is either true or false what *Austin* affirms, that all the universal Church, then, and before also, did own Infants Baptism, and that he also owned the *Donatists* to be members of the Church, and Christians also: if not, that Mr. *Baxter* argues weakly, and his undue reflections return upon himself.

To the first, that some of the universal Church in the ages before *Austin*, did disown, and not practise Infants-Baptism; is evident from undeniable Authority. Was not *Tertullian* of the universal Church or a Christian, who judged it so unwarrantable and irrational as Dr. *Barlow* tells us? and all those in the 2d, and 3d, and 4th. Age that baptized only the adult, neither of the universal Church nor Christians? then, What will Mr. *Baxter* say to his own assertion before mentioned?



mentioned? where he tells us, that *Tertullian*, *Origen*, and *Cyprian*, who lived in the. 2d. and 3d. Cent. do all of them affirm, that in the primitive times, none were baptized without an express Covenant, wherein they renounced the world, flesh; and devil; and engaged themselves to Christ and profest to obey him; and, if there were no other but such, surely some in those dayes must deny Infants Baptism; confirmed also by so many Authorities given in the *Treat. of Baptism*, from p. 55. to. p. 65. and p. 102. And, What will Mr *Baxter* say to that other assertion that he gives us, viz. That Christians had liberty in those first ages to let their Children stay till age before they baptized them? And that *Austin* himself and many Children of Christian Parents were baptized at age? And was that because they owned or dis-owned their baptizing in Infancy? He knows who had need of a good memory.

Were the Parents of *Gregory Nazianzen*, though his father a Bishop at his birth, and *Basil* also, neither members of the universal Church, nor Christians, &c? We might mention divers others, but let these suffice to prove *Austin* rash, and Mr *Baxter* forgetfull; to say no more.

And that some Christians did not own it in *Austins* dayes, is very clear: otherwise, what means all his Arguments he writes in 20. of his books to prove it? and that book he particularly writes upon that poynt, *de Baptismo Parvulorum*, and the great heat and rigour he useth therein? And all the decrees of Councils for it, and many of them procured by his means; were they only

to convince heathens? Mr *Marshall* in his sermon tells us p. 5. that some in those times did question Infants Baptism, as *Austin* grants in his sermon, *de verbis Apostolorum*. But, were none of these, Christians or members of the Church? It may be, in *Austin's* account they were not; because his censures are so heavy, that they should be excommunicated, Anathematized, and shun'd as the Plague, as you have heard.

But, saith Mr *Baxter*, he own'd the Donatists to be members of the Church, and Christians: And own'd their Baptism to be valid. It is true in many places he seemeth so to speak.

But, what he truly thought of their membership, Christianity and Baptism you'l better judge, when you hear him speak.

First to their Church state: it was so good that as Mr *Baxter* grants. p. 245. *Austin* questioned whether salvation was among them; and by his Ep. to *Boniface*, the soldier, instigates him to provoke the Emperour to cut them off, or banish them. Which he did effectually as Mr *Baxter* grants p. 244. who procured that bloody decree from *Honorius*.

And how well he approved of their Baptism he expresth in his book, *de Baptismo cont. Don. Quod sit autem perniciosus, utram omnino non Baptizari aut Rebaptizari, judicare difficile est. Which is most pernicious; either not at all to baptize, or to Rebaptize, is very hard to judge: so that their Baptism was as good as no Baptism, and which, in his own account, rendred them next to heathens: and Tqm. 2. Col. 91. Baptismus apud hereticos*

*hereticos datus, ad vitam eternam non sufficit; That, Baptism given amongst the hereticks, doth not profit to life eternal.* So that, if he did own their Baptism, it was no other then the Baptism of hereticks, and not so good as the Baptism of an old woman, or of an heathen; who in case of necessity or danger of death, did baptize, pronouncing the words of Baptism which they approved of, to salvation.

So that, *Austin's* thus reasoning with the *Donatists*, those Anabaptists then, doth no more prove them approvers of Infants Baptism, than, if Mr. *Baxter* should use the same words with the Anabaptists now (whom, he saith, he owns to be members of the Universal Church, and good Christians too, which is more than *Austin* did) will prove, in another age, that Mr. *Baxter* did thereby demonstrate they own'd Infants Baptism; though only guilty, with the *Donatists*, of rebaptization and sinfull seperation.

Another of his Arguments why the *Donatists* were not against Infants Baptism is; *Because, he saith, they were for Episcopacy; and had ordained-Bishops amongst them, pag. 243. 251.* But, what is that to the purpose? are not the Anabaptists for Episcopacy? and have not they ordained-Bishops, or Elders, amongst them now? But, it is true they have no Lord-Bishops, nor Diocesan-Bishops amongst them: And no more, had they then that I can finde.

And then, after all, concludes with a scoffing Jeer, as though his former Injuries had not been

enough, p. 252. viz. And now if *John Bebold* will say, they were of his side, we must believe him. But how well such Sarcasms become one that would be thought so mortified and grave a Divine; and who is, as he tells us, in the constant sense of his being upon the brink of Eternity, and who hath with no better Arguments opposed his Antagonist; is recommended to the Judgment of the unbiaised Reader. &c.

### SECT. III.

#### *Of the Ancient Britains.*

**T**He next Witness he quarrels with, is, that of the Ancient *Britains*; for which he reproaches me at no small rate, saying, *That this is a witness of great import, if true; but, it's all false still; And, Must our own Countrey, and all our Christian-Ancestours, be thus slander'd?* p. 255. And again, p. 257. But thus, the honour of our Ancestours, and the history of the Church, and the souls of poor ignorant Christians among us, must all be hairously wronged by the falsehoods of rash presuming ignorant men.

But, What cause there is for this *Calumnious railing and shameful detraction*; let the considerate-Reader judge. And for whose better information, and my just vindication in this particular, I desire it may be observed:

That, *First*, what I offer from some Christians amongst the Britains, to this particular, I have given

given my Authorities, grounds, and reasons for the same; which will, amongst all sober just men, free me from being a Forger.

*Secondly*, That it is a testimony that I lay the least stress upon; but, from the probability thereof, through the many concurring circumstances, attending it, have brought it in, amongst so many other witnesses that speak so fully, and positively to the point: yet,

*Thirdly*, That I may vindicate my own integrity, and the reasons offered by me in this matter, I shall do these things;

1<sup>st</sup>, Give you a brief account what I have said in my treatise about it:

2<sup>dly</sup>, The substance of Mr Wills his Objections, and my answer.

3<sup>dly</sup>, What farther Mr Baxter hath either added before he saw my answer to Wills; or, Rejoind thereto since.

*First*, That, amongst the Ancient Britains there were Christians that denyed Infants Baptism; I first gave my grounds, and after vindicated the same from Mr Wills cavills: which was, briefly, thus;

That finding, in Mr Fox those three Demands which Austin made to the Britains, about Keeping of Easter, Baptism, and Preaching, after the manner, usage and custom of Rome; I took notice (among other authors he quoted to make good the same) what Robert Fabian said about it, being one of our English Historians, who wrote in Hen. 6. or Hen. the Seventh's time; who tells us the story expressly, as I have mentioned (i.e.) pag 227.

*Austin*  
Question  
to the Bri-  
tains, as  
Fabian  
reports.



And that as to Baptism, *It was, that they should give Christendom to Children ( which it seems they had omitted ) but they refused the same : and would none of his Hests, as he tells us. And, that he was not mistaken in that particular, I gave six Arguments from several Circumstances about the same, as you have in pag. 228.*

To which Mr *Wills* answers pa. 121; opposing that of *Fabian* to the account that *Bede* gives of the story, which he repeats; giving his reasons from thence, why the Britains did not deny Infants Baptism.

And to which I replied pa. 139, &c. making it good from *Bede's* words that *Fabian* was right. And that they did deny Infants-Baptism; which seems plain from the following reasons, viz.

Why *Fabian* rightly understood *Bede's* words.

Because *Bede* affirms that *Austin* should tell the Monks of Bangor, that they had done contrary to the custom of the Church of Rome, as well as the universal Church [ then ] and Apostolical Church [ before ]; and, amongst the rest, mentions that of Baptism to be one; and which must needs be, in their refusing to baptize children.

First, Because as to the baptizing of the Adult, they were not contrary to the Church of Rome, the universal, and Apostolical Church; as, pag. 288.

Secondly, Neither could it respect the particular mode, Rue, or ceremony, of Baptism: for the custom of the Romish Church therein, was not universal, being so much opposed by the Greek and Eastern Churches, some of the Western not fully agreeing with them therein at thit time; and not at all to be made out, to be Apostolical.

Thirdly,



Thirdly, It must needs therefore respect Infants-Baptism;

First, Because the Church of Rome had particularly enjoined and imposed it, to beget Infants to Regeneration that they might be born of God, as the words of the Canon demonstrate; and which words carry the reason and ends of it: and that they intended the substance, and not the particular ceremony of the ordinance;

Secondly, Because Infants-Baptism was universally received in this seventh age, in other parts of the World, to this end here mentioned;

Thirdly, Because it was received and enjoined to be an Apostolical practice;

Fourthly, It would have been Childish and ridiculous, to have said, Baptism in general was Apostolical which none ever denied, and was so fully before received by them.

Therefore, Austin could intend nothing else, nor Mr Bedes words import any thing else, which therefore Fabian did so fully and significantly represent in saying, give Christendom to children; let them as the Church of Rome has received and enjoined it, be born of God by Baptism, and become Christians as so generally, now received by other Churches also; and which you have been in the neglect of. But they refused the same, which was one reason of their destruction that immediately followed. Which was the substance of my answer to Mr Wills: only that I proved largely against him, that Pelagius was not one of the Monks of Bangor; and that, if he had been one of that society, he had sadly declined both from their principle and

practice, p. 141. As to what I said to Mr Wills upon Bede's words, Mr Bax. thus rejoyns, on his behalf, viz.

Mr B's op-  
position.

Repeating and defending Fabians foppery, he argueth, that it could be nothing else in which they are sayd to contradict the Apostolical Catholick Church [but Infants-Baptism].

Ans. 1st. If Bede say, that Austin tells them that in many things they do contrary to the Roman Catholick and Apostolical Church; doth it follow, that the 3. things, in which he requireth their concurrence, were all parts of those many? To preach the Gospel to the Saxons was one; is that a point that they differed from all the Apostolick Church in? when it seemeth to be from no other reason than that they would not own the Saxons that had conquered them; nor the Papal power, that would usurp upon them: and on the same reasons, they might as well refuse to baptize the Saxons children.

Ans. To which I answer: that this about Infants-Baptism doth appear to be one of the many things that they did, contrary to the Roman, as well as to the then universal Church; appears from the grounds before-given, not yet answered; and which is sufficient to my purpose, though it would be good in neither of the other two. But, as to the Monks of Bangor's preaching then, to the Saxons, who appear to be laymen and unordained; to be sure, they therein did contrary to the Roman and universal, however they did to the Apostolical, Church: and, for refusing the Papal ordination, without which they could not be admitted to preach with them,

to the Saxons; they did as well so to do, as to refuse *Christendom* to children; one being as little *Apostolical*, as the other. Neither doth it appear, that though the Saxons had conquered them a hundred years before, that they did refuse to preach to them, or baptize them; there being no cause for the same, upon any score of reason or truth, as Mr Baxter vainly imagines;

But, 2ly, saith he; *There is no such thing in the words of Bede as (he saith) he hath shewed* [but according to the manner of Rome]; and who knows not, that the Church of Rome and all in its Communion, then called the universal Church, used in Baptism the white-Garment, milk, and honey; as an *Apostolical Tradition*; or such as they know no original of. *Textulian and Epiphanius* are full witnesses of this, if there were no more. To which second answer of his, I say; that, the reason why Chrism, and Exorcism, could not be the only thing then intended; I have before given my grounds, whereof he takes no notice; and, that the universal Church is put in distinction to the Roman, let Bede's own words speak, viz. *Nostre consuetudini*, that is, the Roman custom as Mr Wills owns; immo *universalis Ecclesie*, there is the custom of the universal Church;

And it is well known, that the *Geek Church*, in this age, did as much differ, from the *Latine* in those abominations, as the Monks of Bangor did from the Roman *Christnings* and ordination, and for which they Excommunicated one another, and rebaptized each other.

What good thoughts Mr B. has of Chrism and Exor-

Exorcism, those horrid execrable blasphemies as *Homini* calls them; and, how fain he would perswade us, that they are Apostolical from his full witness he tells us of, we shall tell him of, and reckon with him for, hereafter.

In the next place, we shall give you some return to the answer Mr B. makes to my six reasons why they denyed Infants-Baptism.

M.B's objections to my 6. reasons answered.  
 1<sup>st</sup> Reason.  
 1. From their so early receiving the Gospel, before Infants-Baptism was practised.

The First was, because they received the Gospel so early in the Apostles-times; there being no such thing as Infants-Baptism to be found in the Apostles practise, nor heard of, in the Asia-tick Churches for some ages, as I proved; and for their so early receiving the Gospel, I made good from *Gildas*, their own Historian, viz. in the days of *Tiberius Caesar*, and that *Tertullian*, *Origen*, *Eusebius*, *Basil*, *Chrysostom*, makes early mention of their Christianity.

To which Mr. B. saith, that, they did not so early receive the Gospel, and, that it was by the Roman Sculdiers, when they did; who built a Temple in Kent: But weakens none of my Authorities.

2dly, He saith, that the Asia Church had Infants-Baptism amongst them, in Gregories time, of which no man doubts; But what is that, to the first Centuries we speak of? wherein we hear of as little Infants-Baptism at Rome, as at Jerusalem.

2<sup>d</sup> Reason.  
 Because they so cleaved to the letter of the scriptures.

The Second Reason he opposeth, was this, viz. Because, it appears they so fully prized and faithfully adhered to the Scriptures, both for Doctrine; and Discipline; wherein, no such thing

thing is to be found, as hath been mentioned and confest.

To which he saith three things; First, *that I would thereby insinuate, that there is no such thing to be found in Scripture.* I.

*Ans<sup>r</sup>.* Which I do indeed, till some body make it appear; and which never was yet done, notwithstanding the vain-glorious boait of plain-Scripture-proof, and since, *More proofs.*

2dly, *That, as much as the Ancient Britains cleaved to the Scripture; yet were there all Impietyes and wickedness in the Nation, as saith Gildas in his Complaint.* 2.

No doubt of it: for, I quote his very words, that there was but some amongst them that received the precepts of Christ intirely, whilst others of them, less sincerely; and the generality, very formally, p. 332. I, respecting only the true Church amongst them, the generality of the Nation being vicious and wicked, as other Nations were; Christs flock being but a little flock.

3dly, *That, by the same Argument, all that cleave to the Scripture should be against it also, both in former and latter times:* No doubt, but it should be so: Especially amongst them that renounce Tradition, and tells us, *that what is practised in the Worship of God, without some express precept, or practise in the Word to warrant it, is Wilt-worship and Idolatry;* ought Naturally to shun such a practise as is to be made out by neither, as confest by themselves. 3.

The Third was, Because they did so vehemently 3d Reason.



Because  
they were  
such ene-  
mies to  
Tradition.

mently respect humane tradition, as the worship of God; especially all Roman Inventions, Rites, and Ceremonies: this, as before undeniably appearing to come from Rome's Ordination and Imposition.

To which he demands of me, *Whether I will not confess, that Cyprian's Carthaginian Council, Basil, and Austin, were for Infants-Baptism; were these Papists or Romans, and can I prove any Roman ordination before these?*

To which I say, That *Cyprian's* letter (as is said) to *Fidus*, declares for it, to take away Original guilt: and, because children pray in their crying, none doubt. That *Basil* doth any where assert it, I am yet to learn; or, that it was judged necessary; or, it was ever ordained with imposition, till *Pope Innocents* Canon in the *Carthaginian Council* (*Austin* presiding in that Council); I am yet to be informed, having many learned men of my side; And, if those Canons were not Romish, let all men judge.

2dly, He demands of me, *Whether the Britains were against Traditions and ceremonies? and, Had they not Bishops, and Monks, &c?*

To which I say, they were against traditions & ceremonies especially Romish; and that serves our turn, for Infants-baptism. But, as to their *Bishops*; if he mean *Elders*, so have we: and so had the *Donatists*. But that they had *Prelates* or *Lord-Bishops*, doth not yet appear. And as for the *Monkery*; no *Romish Monks* (saith *Fuller* in his Church-history) being *Abbey-labourers* not *Abbey-lubbers*; who laboured with their own hands,  
and



and preached the Gospel ; much in the way the Waldenses were in ; being together in colledges, having all things in common amongst them, in imitation of the primitive times.

3dly, *He demands of me, Whether Independents are not more against Tradition, than the Britains?*

I say, Not whilst they hold Infants-Baptism : and, though they are against Traditions in word, yet not, in deed, in this thing ; as I make appear by many Arguments in my answer to Mr Wills ; which I earnestly recommend to all their considerations, pa. 72. to 79.

4 Reason, Because *Constantine* the son of *Helen* was not baptized till aged. *He denies Constantine Chlorus, the Father of Constantine, to have been a Christian but only a favourer of them ; or, that Helen, his mother, was so at Constantines Birth : and whether he was born in England, doubtful.* For proof whereof, I must refer you to our Chronicles ; who generally tells us, He was born in *England* ; and, that his Father was a *Christian*, *Eusebius* tells us, *Bonus à bono, Pius à pio* : and, that his mother was so at his Birth, I must recommend you to *Grotius* and *Dailley*, better Historians, than Mr B. or my self, to answer you ;

4. Reason. Because Constantine the son of Helen was not baptized till aged.

A fifth Reason was, from the correspondency and unity, that was betwixt the French Christians and them, afterwards called the *Waldenses*, who had colledges like them, communicated with them, in the ministry, &c. both in preaching and Baptism, viz. *Germanus* and *Lupus*. About which he makes a great dust ; especially relating

5. Reason. From the correspondencies that were betwixt the French Churches and them.

relating to *Getmannus* and *Lupus*, out of the legends in *Baronius* and *Prosper*, how that some would have them come from the Pope, and their Miracles they wrought with reliques; others, from the Bishops in France: Therefore, not from the French-Christians.

And, that the Waldenses were not a people now; nor, were any known of that judgement, till long after; And which if I could make good, I should do them Knights-service against the Papists, in the Question of the perpetual visibility of the Church, this being anno. 429.

Concerning which, what Knights-service it may do, I leave him to improve it: But, I conceive I have fully made appear, that the Churches of the Lyonists, or poor people of Lyons or Waldenses, are already made out to us, throughout most of the Centuries. *Enselinus* tells us of the suffering of their Churches under *Antoninus Verus*, anno 179. made out also by *Motland*, *Sculdetus*, *Beza*; Confest by the Papists themselves, *Rainerius*, *Belvedere*, and *Riberia*; as *Treat.* p. 333. 340. 341. to 345.

*Jeffery Munmouth* tells us, that, as long as the British Churches possessed the Countrey, they kept themselves sound in the faith, and pure in the Worship order and discipline of Christ, as it was delivered to them from the Apostles and the Evangelists; who were not conquered, till about 455. as *Peter Heylins Cosmography* shews. p. 310.

*Beza* tells us, That, *Constance* upon the Revelations sheweth, that the Reformation of the Church

in the West parts of the world, began in France ; and that from their source, it spread it self through the rest of Europe ;

And, That the French Christians, as well as other of the Western Churches, baptized only the adult; I conceive the famous *Hilary*, Bishop of *Poitou*, tells us, in his sermon upon the 25. of *Math.* His words are these, *Venturi ad baptismum; prius confitentur credere se in Dei Filio, & in Passione, & in Resurrectione ejus*, that whoever comes to Baptism must first confess That they believe in the son of God, in his death and Resurrection, &c. This I added to my Reasons, in my reply ; whereof *M.B.* takes no notice : And, That it was long before the French-Christians did generally baptize children ; appears by *Beatus Rhenanus* in his Annotations upon *Tertullian*, who sayth, That the old custome was, that those that were come to their full growth, were Baptized with the bath of Regeneration : which custome was observed, until the time of *Charles the great*, and *Lodowick*, Emperours, ( as by the statutes by them established appeareth ) who ordained and gave express Commandement, that the Priests should not baptize any but at the feast of Easter, and Pentecost ; except in the Extremity of sickness, and danger of death. As a Dutch Author ( called, A plain and well grounded treatise of Baptism ) hath it, p. 18. And which *Basil* tells us, was also the custome of the Eastern Churches in that Age, in his Exhortation to Baptism, *Non alios quam catechumenos baptizatos esse*, That no other were baptized but the Catechumens. And, in his 3d book against

Eunomius, *Must the faithful be sealed with Baptism? Faith must needs precede, or go before.* And Fuller in his Church-History. p 28. tells us, out of *Eucherius ad Hilarium*, that this *Lupus*, the French-Apostle, was a near kinsman of *Hilarie's*; and their baptizing in Rivers discovers, It was not a work for children; and that they had not many Children with them in that work.

And further, Under this head, he tells us (as an Argument, *that these Britains were not against Infants Baptism*) that *Pelagius*, one of the Britains, was for *Infants-Baptism*: concerning which I must yet refer you to what I have already said to Mr *Wills*, whercof Mr *Baxter* takes no notice.

6 Reason.  
From An-  
stins Letter to Gre-  
gory, to  
know how  
long the  
Baptism of  
a child  
might be  
defer'd.

The Sixth and last reason was, because *Austin* himself (upon the discourses, it seems, he met with, upon this point in Britain) writes to Pope *Gregory*, that sent him, To know, how long the baptizing of a child might be deferred, there being no danger of death, Which he greatly scorns, and saith, *He is ashamed that he has meddled with such a Collector, à Baculo ad Angulum: And, doth it not rather imply, that there was no controversy betwixt him and the Britains, about Infants-Baptism, seeing he never mentioned any such thing?* The quite contrary seems to be: for if they had not so-discoursed the point [deferring Childrens-Baptism till they came to Age that they might answer for themselves before Baptism] and gravelled him about it; What needed he to have sent to *Rome* for better Information about it? Then doth our scornful ad-  
versary

versary p. 226. conclude like himself, viz. Reader, will not this kind of Arguing make thee an Anabaptist? or else, make thee pity the seduced party? Oh! what a Temptation to popery do such men lay before the people, when men see that every such a one that hath ignorance and pride enough to make him wise in his own eyes, shall thus pour out falsehoods to cheat mankind; and the ignorant know not, but it may be all true. It tempteth men, to think that there must be some Authorized men, whom the ignorant must believe before such seducers; or else, confusion and falshood will take place of truth, and the people will be as children tossed up and down, and carryed to and fro, with every wind of doctrine. And indeed, a Concordant Ministry is to be preferred, though it inferr not a Roman infallibility.

But, whether Mr B. may deserve to be one of these Authorized men and Concordant Ministers, to save us from popery, and seducing, and from being tossed to and fro, will be better understood when you have read some of the following Chapters.

*Some particular Witnesses, justified; taken out of the Dutch Book of Martyrs.*

#### SECT. IV.

*My Integrity in those quotations out of the Dutch Book of Martyrs, vindicated.*

**I**N the next place he falls very foul upon me, for some *Quotations* out of the *Dutch Martyrology*: and of about forty particular witnesses, for believers only, or, against *Infants-Baptism*; he excepts but against eight, or nine, viz. The *Missalians*, (as he calls them,) *Faustus Regiensis*, *Albanus*; *Apamen*; *Adrian*; *Egyptian-Divines*; *Birinus*, *Hincmarus*, & *Smaragdus*. All which in his usual civility he is pleased to tell me *Are my gross slanders, forged Fables, or deceitful falsifications*;

Of what sort these Quotations are.

In return whereto, it will be necessary to speak something in general respecting the *Quotations* I have given out of that Book; and then give you a particular account of these that he hath pickt out, to make his *Exceptions* against.

1. Either some late Martyrs and Confessors.

*First*, as to those quotations; you'll find them to be of these several sorts; 1st. Either of such confessors or Martyrs that they have recorded in the latter centuries for denying *Infants-baptism*, whereof their own testimonies may be as *Authentick*, as our renowned *Fox*, for our protestant Martyrs, and Confessors. Though the Papists who had their hands in those bloody persecutions;



cutians, have not more slighted and contemned that our worthy *Historian*, than Mr B. who hath had so great a hand to help forward the *persecution* of the *Anabaptists* (as I shall hereafter make appear) hath unduly contemned, and slighted, our *Dutch Historians*, for that their worthy Collection, of those renowned *Sufferers*, and *Confessors*.)

2dly. Or such *Martyrs* or *Confessors* in former times, for which they quote their *Century writers* sometimes mentioning the *Antiquities* recorded by them, and sometimes not. As, we many times quote the *Magdeburgenses*, *Fox*, *Sculvetus*, *Osiander*, *Baronius*, *Usher*, without mentioning the antiquities they refer to: So, do they their *Twisk*, *Frank*, *Merningus*, *Montanus* &c. who learnedly collected from antiquity those *stories* and *passages* they refer to, without mentioning always their *Ancient authorities*, for the same; Concerning whom I may shortly be able to give a better account having sent for the books themselves.

2. Or former *Martyrs* and *Confessors*.

3dly. I desire it may be taken notice of, That neither those particular instances that Mr B. excepts against, nor any other that I know of, taken out of that book, do I produce as *positive testimony* in the first place to prove any thing, but as *collateral witnesses* to confirm something before proved: as for instance, If I prove the *Waldenses* did deny *Infants-baptism*, and produce for the same *Eckbertus Cluniacensis*, *Racnarius* & others from antiquity to make it good; and add, for confirmation, either such *modern*

3. None of them for positive testimony without originall proof.

*Authors* of our own, witnessing to the same, or some of these our *Dutch Historians* out of that collection; it may go as far as modern *Authority* may reach, so that if they prove *lame* or not so *pertinent*, the matter is the less. But if I produce, with their *Country-writers*, their *antiquities* also; that will go for original proof

4. The Authors are responsible for the truth, not the quoter

4thly. That, what I say from them, I producing faithfully their *Authorities* to make it good, will not, I presume, in common *justice* be reputed my *forgery*, *fable*, or *falsehood*, if their's should prove so; which is the measure Mr B. metes out to me; it being so much the work of *Cavilers*, If they cannot find a *hole*, they will endeavour to make one.

All which being premised; we shall examine what *cause* there is for his *hainous reflections* upon these few of those many *witnesses* mentioned from them; and, whether they are not fairly to be *justified* from his *injurious Cavils*.

1. *Dadoes Sabas. &c.*

The first of them he mentions, is, My *forges*, and *false stories*, of the *Messalians*, as he calls them, viz. those eminent men *Dadoes*, and his *companions*, who in the 4th Century were reckoned in the *Romish Catalogue* of *Hereticks*, For having an *ill opinion* of *Infants-baptism*, and for saying, *Prayers without baptism*, signified nothing; and that, it was *prayer*, not *Exorcism*, that profited to expel the *Devil*. For which they quote *Sebastian Frank* that wrote the *Chronicle* of the *Romish hereticks* or *Ketters*; and the *Tripartite History*, from which I presume he collected it.

Mr Baxter, to detect the forgery, quotes part of the *Tripartite History* and very partially also; telling us that these *Messalians* were filthy *Hcretisks*, who did affirm, That Prayer was all, and that baptism and the Lords supper was nothing, and so might indeed deny Infants-baptism; as heathens do, who deny all baptism, p. 267.

Mr B. unfair in his partial quotation.

But if you look into the *Tripartite History*, (so called because gathered from *Theodoret*, *Sozomen*, and *Socrates*) you'll finde that these call'd *Messalians* are put upon record for the *Eutichian-heresie*, as denying the *Sacraments*: And advancing prayer above what was meet, and which you will finde to be upon this very account, viz. There being two erroneous things asserted at this day about the *Sacraments*, especially in administering of them to little ones; The one, that Baptism was profitable by the act done, to take away sin, save the soul, and to drive away the Devil: In opposition whereto, they are said to assert thus; viz. *Nullam quidem utilitatem ex sancto baptismo baptizatis accidere; sed solum studiosam orationem inhabitantem Daemonem fugare*. That by the act of Baptism no good comes to the baptized; and that fervent prayer only expells the Devil; in opposition to their *Exorcisms* or *superstitions*. And, that this was the true meaning, the Margent of the Book over against this passage, confirms; *Heresis negantium gratiam in baptismo conferri*, The Heresy of those that deny'd grace to be conferred in Baptism. The other, was about the *Eucharist*; it being affirmed at this day as by *Austin* and others afterwards, (from *Jo. 6.*

*Except a man eat the flesh of Christ, &c.*) that it was necessary to give children that *Sacrament* also, for their Salvation. They are affirmed to say thus, viz. *Divinum cibum nihil nec prodesse, nec ledere*, That the divine meat (viz. in the outward eating of it) neither did profit nor hurt (viz. to little-ones as to salvation or damnation) though, say their enemies, *De quo, Dominus dixit Christus, Qui comedit carnem meam, & bibit sanguinem meum vivet in aeternum*, Concerning whom the Lord Christ hath said, he that eats my flesh and drinks my blood, shall live eternally. And from whence their *Adversaries* did infer, that they made prayer all and undervalued both the *Ordinances* as nothing, and therefore call'd them the *Eutichians*, or *praying-Heretics*, and the *Enthusiasts*. Though I do not know, that It is so heretical to say, *Prayer is all*, in some sense; for, it is so all, that without personal and spiritual prayers, there is no regeneration, it being the principal sign thereof, *Acts. 9.* And so by consequence, no ordinance to profit without it; So fully excluding infants from partaking in either of those *Ordinances*. The like nick names and reproches they gave the *Waldenses* after, for witnessing against their Breeder-God; and for saying that *Grace was not conferr'd by the act of Baptism*; That therefore, they denied both those *Sacraments*; and laid them under the like *calumnies*, as *unclean*, *flethy dreamers*; as they did these very men. Which was also reflected upon the *Priscillianists*, and *Novatians*, to this day also: And *Thomas Walden*, I finde calls the *Wickliffists*

*Miss. l. aut,*

*Messalians*, whom he accused for denying infants-baptism). See *Historia Ecclesiast. Tripartit.* l. 7. c. 11. p. 406. 407.

The next is, *Faustus Rhegiensis*; which he saith <sup>2</sup> *Faustus Rhegiensis* is my slander. Concerning whom I tell you what they say from *Merningus history of Baptism*, who I presume quotes it from the *Authority it self*; which it is true I did not mention and for which he quarrels me; though, as to the words, said to be his, he owns: being, as he saith, so agreeable to his own sentiments, viz. That personal and actual desire was requisite in everyone that was to be baptized; for which they quote, *Lib. 2. de Arbit. c. 8. Jacob Merning* p. 415. Therefore, I hope the Reader will acquit me of the slander in this particular, as we shall acquit Mr B. of contradicting Reason, Scripture, and sense, when he reconciles this position with *Infants baptism*.

The 3d is, *Albanus*: which he chargeth as my <sup>3.</sup> *Albanus* deceit; for whose *Martyrdom* for asserting believers & denying Infants-baptism, I mention their Quotation from *Twisk Frank* and *Baronius*. Concerning whom he saith, he can finde no such particular persons in his book (viz. *Baronius only*), that there was some trouble given to the *Anabaptists* about that time which he supposed respected only the *Donatists* for *Rebaptization*; But why my deceit, or theirs either, I see not. They say, that *Albanus* was martyr'd at *Mentz*, out of the history of *Andrew Hondorff* p. 143. And also, quote the bloody Decree of *Theodosius* for Death and banishment, for baptizing otherwise than the Church appoynted, out of *Baronius* which Mr *Baxters*



74 Ch.2.Sect.4. *Witnesses justified out of the  
Baxters modesty calls, some trouble to the Ana-  
baptists.*

4. *Apa-  
men.*

The 4th mentioned by him, is, My gross falsification of *Nicephorus*, and slander, as he calls it of *Apamen*, and concerning whom I tell you what they mention from *Twisk Chron.* and the *Magdeburgs*, how that *Apamen* and *Zoroaras* in *Syria*, were *Anabaptists*, which they take in a modern sense: but Mr B. conceives it respected both old and young, and not only those that had been baptized in infancy. But, whether he hath therefore such cause to censure them for thinking otherwise; and me also, as a falsifyer for quoring them; is submitted to better Judgment.

5. *Adria-  
nus.*

The 5th is, My false story, as he calls it, of *Adrianus*, Bishop of *Corinth*; concerning whom, I acquaint you what they mention from *Mirningus*, *Montanus*, *Frank* and the *Magdeburgs*, viz. That he denyed *Infants-Baptism*, suffered young Children to die without it, and gave so great trouble in it also, that occasioned the decree of the Council of *Bracerence*, to confirm it.

As to which Mr. B. acknowledges that *Adrian* was indeed accused that some *Infants*, by his means, dyed without *Baptism*; but saith, it was a malevolent accusation; and that it was only, for delaying the baptizing of the infants of some excommunicated persons. But, whether so, or no; or that that Canon of the 2d *Bracerence* Council for baptizing Children, was made upon that account of his denying it, as affirmed by them, is left to Judgment. You have my tale, and my tales-master, and for me to be reputed a forger if it prove otherwise



otherwise would be hard measure. Mr. Wills, it seems, saw so much cause to believe it, that he confesseth *Adrianus* was a competent witness in the case.

The next he quarrels me for, is *Birinus*: concerning whom I only tell you, what he gathers from Bede, l. 3. c. 7. l. 4. c. 16. viz. That he professeth Instruction to be so necessary before Baptism, that, without it, Baptism ought not to be administered to high or low, as p. 22. 6. Birinus.

For which, Mr. B. p. 272. compar'd with his contents, severely reproveth me for fiction, and for falsification of Bede, 1st. Because Bede, he saith, only tells us of one *Bernwin* who preached, converted, and baptized; and what was that, to the purpose? but, not a word of *Birinus*, that so professed. 2dly. Nor was the business done, as he saith, in lower Saxony but in the Isle of Wight: so little is there that hath the least kin to truth, in this lamentable reporter. Bernwin

To which I say, First, that, I have quoted my Authorities right, let them be accountable for the fictions and falsifications, not I, if there be any: it being injustice to make me guilty of both, as Mr. B. doth.

But 2dly. If my Author has acquitted himself in both, What doth Mr. B. deserve for such temerity, rash and injurious Censure? And, that he hath so done, let the Reader Judge. My Dutch Author mentions two places out of Bede as before; the first, tells us of *Birinus* preaching to the people of lower or West Saxony, and to their King *Kinigilsus*, who embracing the faith of the Gospel, Mr B's ignorance and rashness detected.

76 Cha. 2. Sect. 4. *Witnesses justified out of the*  
*Gospel, did after he had taken an account of the*  
*faith of the King, and several of the people, bap-*  
*tize them. Besides words are these, l. 3. c. 7. Ea*  
*tempore, Gens Occidentalium Saxonum, qui anti-*  
*quitus Geviffe v cabamur, pradicante illis verbum*  
*Byrino, Regnante Cynigilso, fidem Christi susce-*  
*pit. Itaque, Evangelizante illo in praeftu Pro-*  
*vinciarum, Rex ipse catechizatus, fonte Baptismi*  
*cum sua gente ablueretur.* The other l. 4. c. 16.  
 mentions *Brenwin's preaching and baptizing in*  
*the Isle of Wight in the like manner.* So that here  
 is neither fiction nor falsification of *Bede*; here is  
*Birinus* preaching in lower Saxony, baptizing  
 only such as made a profession of faith; neither  
 doth *Brenwin*, the other instance referr'd to in  
 their quotation, baptize any other that is menti-  
 oned. But, saith *Mr. Baxter*, the *Isle of Wight*  
 is not in lower Saxony, where *Brenwin* preacht;  
 but, if it was not, it is enough that it appears  
 that *Birinus* preacht and baptized in lower Sax-  
 ony which is without dispute. And, that the *Isle*  
*of Wight* did also belong to the kingdom of  
 west Saxony, is manifest; because *Hampshire,*  
*Sussex, Southampton, &c.* whereof the *Isle of*  
*Wight* is a member, was within the compass  
 of it, as *Peter Heylin* in his *Cosmography* in  
 the description of Britain p. 11. tells us, and  
*Mr Fox* his Mapp of west Saxony 1 Vol. p. 141.  
 So little is there that hath the least kin to truth  
 in this our lamentable reprove.

7. Egypti-  
 an divines.

The 7th. is My Table (as he calls it) about  
 the *Egyptian Divines*: concerning whom, I tell  
 you what they say from *Pamellus* upon *Tertulli-*

an,

an; and *Viccomes*, viz. *How that they in opposition to the Church of Rome, taught, that Teaching and faith should go before Baptism.*

To which he saith, p. 237. *That some indeed in Egypt did, he grants, separate from the Church of Rome, but supposeth that this might respect only the Adult; which all the Christian world, he saith, ownes.*

In answer whereto, I say; It is true, the Christian world do so, when some of the Heathen-World, as they call them, viz. *Jews or Pagans*, come amongst them for it (which is very rare): But this, it seems, as they tell us, was *Doctrine* contrary to the *Church of Rome*; which must therefore, as they conceive, be respecting the *baptizing of Infants*; whom they, Mr. B. and others of the *Christian world*, baptize without *personal Teaching*, and *Faith* preceding it. Therefore, what a *Fabler* I am here, let it be judged also.

The next is, My Forgery, as his contents calls <sup>8. Hincmarus.</sup> it, about *Hincmarus Laudunensis*, of whom we also tell you what they say from the *Bib. Pat. Magdeb. Montanus*, and *Viccomes*: viz. *That he denied Baptism to little ones, suffering them to die without it, and for which the Bishop of Rhemes opposed him with both the Authority of the Canon, and Scripture-Law, viz. Jo. 3. 5. p. 233.*

To which Mr B. saith, that *All that I can finde upon a cursory perusal of the Bib. Pat. is, that, he was accused for letting some infants die without it, which he supposeth might be as before in Adrianus his case. p. 273.*

But

But how farr his supposition in the case will prevail to make me a forger, and will refute the evidence of the *Authorities* mentioned; is submitted to the judicious Reader, who withall must know that *Viccomes* lib. 2. c. 1. (no friend to the *Anabaptists*) doth rank *Hincmarus* of *Laodun* in the Catalogue of those that deny infants-baptism, and quotes for it the bishop of *Rhemes* letter to make it good. And also, it must be remembred (by Mr *Baxter's* leave) that his brother *Wills* saw so much truth and equity in the case, as to allow me *Hincmarus*, as well as *Adrianus*, for another witness against *Infants-Baptism*: but, now I must be a forger for the same.

9. *Smaragdus*.

There is another, viz. *Smaragdus*, put in his postscript; concerning whom I tell you what they say, viz. That he was first a defender, then afterwards an opposer of *Infants-Baptism*; affirming, that he taught, that they were first to teach, then afterwards to baptize those so taught. Concerning whose doctrine, about *Infants-baptism* Mr *Baxter* doth give us many Instances, p. 407. &c. And withall tells, that *Smaragdus* knew how to reconcile this saying to *Infants-Baptism* also.

Which when Mr *B.* can do in his own case, we may the better believe *Smaragdus* might do so also: but till then, if he did as Mr *B.* tells us, assert this doctrine at the same time he did *Infants-Baptism*, we must suppose he did then as much contradict both himself and the plain evidence of the *Scripture*, as Mr *B.* doth now: who sometimes tells us, that the Commission in the

28. of *Mat.* doth respect the Adult only ; and sometimes, Parents doing it for the children in their names and steads.

Thus I have gone through these few of the exceptions he makes of the many *witnesses* I have mentioned from the *Dutch book of Martyrs*. Which, I suppose, may be sufficient to acquit me from his *virulent charge* concerning them, if not justify my *Authors* also from his *severe censures* : for, what I presume he hath not himself justified, their *antiquities* will. Withall clayming so much *justice*, that those many he hath not *excepted* against, may *favourably* be allowed me ; at least, till he or some body else, give any just *exception* against them ; his silence in the *mean time*, giving in his *consent* thereto : these he has pickt out, being only such as he *supposed* he had the greatest *advantage* against.

---

SECT. V.

## SECT. V.

*The Waldensian witness justified.*

**I**N the next place, we shall hear what he hath to say to the witness born by the *Waldenses*, my principal witness against Infants-baptism: And which we must gather up in that method I gave it you in, and which you'll finde to be under 4. Heads, *viz.* 1<sup>st</sup>, From their confessions of faith: 2<sup>dly</sup>, From their most eminent leading men, who have deny'd it. 3<sup>ly</sup>, From the evidence of it, from many learned men who opposed them in it; and decrees of Councils against them for it; 4<sup>ly</sup>, From the footsteps they left of it, in the several Countreyes where they were dispersed.

1. Head. *From their Confessions of Faith justifying it.*

Their ancient Confessions of faith witnessing hereto, I gave you p. 239. and which did so confound Mr *Wills* that, till he had lopp't off what he thought good ( a very disingenuous thing ) he could say nothing to; but then, tells us, It was no other then what all the. Protestants held: Which theft of his I detected in my *Reply*. p. 110. by filling up the spaces with black lines. And then shewd him the great disagreement betwixt the faith of the Protestant Pædo-baptists, and them: notwithstanding which evidence ( and, I think undeniable demonstration ) Mr *Baxter*, his partner, is so far from owning the fraud, and answering my 6. Arguments confirming



firming the truth of the thing, that he so far justifies Mr Wills, as to tell us, p. 379. thus, viz. (In his reply p. 108.) *He reassumeth this calumny of the Waldenses, and First, he reciterh their Confession, to prove it, as if he wanted matter to fill up his book, &c.* Then mentions one or two (but answers none) proceeding to tell the world, how I face them down that the *Waldenses* deny'd Infants Baptism from such silly Reasons, as is intolerable. *And that it is not worth the labour to shew him, how the Protestants agree with the Waldenses in all the points where he feigneth a disagreement, p. 112.*

An excellent way to answer Arguments; as though huffing and hectoring would do it. But Mr Baxter is mistaken in the story; for he must either answer those Arguments, or confess that he cannot, which demonstrate that the *Waldenses* did, in these Confessions exclude Infants from baptism: and which, the better to discover Mr Baxters unfaithfulness, and for the Reader's satisfaction and conviction, I shall resume here to repeat, out of the 112, 113. p. of my Reply, because he answers them with such a slight, viz.

*First, Do all the Pædobaptists believe, that Baptism and preaching of the word are joynd together, to instruct the baptized parties; and that thereby they have union with Christ and partake of his benefits? Pray how is that to be made good in any infant, that has no actual knowledg, faith, or understanding?*

*Secondly, do they indeed believe the Lords Supper to belong in Common with Baptism to all the mem-*

*The Waldenses differ from the Pædobaptists in 6 maine things in their confessions.*

*bers of the Church?* why then do not Infants partake of one as well as the other, since it belongs to them in Common, if members of the Church; as Mr. *Wills* saith, they are?

*Thirdly*, Do Pædobaptists with the Waldenses believe (as you say) that water in Baptism is the usual sign, representing to the subject thereof, the invisible vertue of God operating in them, viz. Renovation of the Spirit, and mortification of their members? And can it be truly said, it is so to an infant, that is not capable to put forth any act of faith, Repentance, or Mortification, or discern any the least sign in the water, of any such things signified thereby?

*Fourthly*, Have they indeed a Harmony with the Waldenses, in what further they confess, concerning this ordinance? viz. that by it they are received into the holy Congregation of the people of God, there professing and declaring openly their faith and amendment of life? But, how is the Infant capable, with the Waldensian-Christians (not Pagan Converts), to profess and declare openly their faith and Repentance, and so to be Received into the Congregation thereby?

*Fifthly*, Do Pædobaptists indeed believe, with them, that human Traditions and Inventions are to be esteemed Anti-Christian abominations; and vain worship, and that that worship is vain and Traditional, when persons are enjoyned to it without faith, and truth? Why then are Infants Baptized by them, that have no faith or knowledge of truth? and for which there is neither Precept or example in Gods word? and, by themselves

themselves ownd to be an unwritten Tradition?

Sixtly, do they believe, That *Anti-Christ*, doth ground all Christianity and Religion in the Baptism of children, attributing Regeneration to that outward work done, contrary to the holy spirit? Why when do they Baptize Children, which, as acknowledged, is the basis, and foundation of the false Church, and so contrary to the spirit; and for which there is nothing but the decrees of Popes and Anti-Christian Councils, to warrant it?

Whereby you see that Infants are manifestly excluded Baptism, in these 6 particulars in these confessions; and that Pædobaptists cannot assert the same without evident contradiction to themselves.

So having proved it from their ancient confessions, I gave a particular Reply to the usual Objections about their late contrary confessions; and of which there are 4. which I prove were not made till the 16. Century, and how contradictory they are, not only to the former confessions, but to themselves also in those their new confessions, from p. 309. to p. 321. Treat. And which I tell M. Wills I have done with great exactness, giving a particular account of all those confessions word for word.

To which Mr Baxter replies, thus p. 380. Wonderful! That such a man should talk of exactness and demonstration! stay Reader a little, and tell me whether it is all not for shame and tears, that one such Book should be written by a Christian? much more that this Calumny should be thus over and over au-

dacionously justified.

Excellently well argued! But, where is the convincing Demonstration to prove that they had any confessions for Infants-Baptism, elder then the 16. Century, to justify these big words? And for gainsaying of which I am so inhumanely taunted and reproach't? why, Have patience and you I have it in the next lines, where he gives us (as he tells us) one of their confessions, of a farr elder date, from one of our English Historians, telling us, viz.

The Waldensian confession of faith M. B. produceth for Infants-Baptism.

By Roger Windesore, (our chiefeft ancient Chronicler, and one whom he oft commendeth himself, and therefore should have read) in Henry 2d fol. 319. you have a confession of the Thousians, call'd boni homines; in which are these words, *Credimus etiam quod non saluatur quis, nisi qui Baptizatur; & parvuli salvantur per Baptisma*. That is, we believe also, that none is saved but he that is Baptized and that little Children are saved by Baptism. For we judge, that it was the denial of the saving virtue of wicked Priests-Baptism (to young or old) as working *ex opere operato*, which occasioned their accusations (intimating that this Confession was sound and Orthodox, viz. That, in a Protestant sense, none are saved but by Baptism; and that little Children are saved by Baptism, though in a Popish sense, it is corrupt and dangerous. (Excellent good doctrine and well gloss to deliver this from being Popish!) And then sets it off with a flourish, *And what would you have more*, implying, A fuller proof, and demonstration could not well be given to prove that

that their confession for infants-Baptism, was as ancient as what I had given for the contrary; this being in H. 2. time in the 12. Century; and therefore sufficient to prove me an audacious person.

The confession Examined and found Popish altogether.

Concerning which most remarkable story brought in by Mr Baxter to render me so ridiculous, and upon which he layes so much stress; it is meet I give you some distinct account, (And it is very well, the book is to be met with, in any other place than in M. B's Library; for truly as he has dealt with us one would think it was not). Know therefore, our English Roger Winderover, or Hoveden, gives a large account of this story. (Mr Baxter takes it out of the London-Edition; mine is out of the Franckfort, by Sir Hen. Savil; but both one as I have compared them together;) who, in p. 555. gives the History of it to p. 560. The Head of the Chapter is, *Heresis Arriana, Ejusque damnatio, the Heresy of the Arrians and their condemnation* (for, so they called the Waldenses, because they deny'd the deity of Christ, as lifted up in the Eucharist by a priest). And of this very people, mention'd by Hoveden, Bishop Usher in his *State and Success*; p. 294. tells us, *Istos autem, de quibus agit Hovedenus non fuisse alios quam Waldenses, &c.* Those of whom Hoveden speak were no other than Waldenses, as Jacob Gretserus tells us, upon good evidence: though, by their adversaries, called Arrians or Manichees, &c. So much, as to the prologue, The story it self begins thus. *Erant itaque in provincia Tolosana quidam Heretici, qui*



*se appellari faciebant Bonos-homines, &c. That, there were certain hereticks in the Province of Tholouse, that would be called The good-men, detained by the souldiers who held and taught the People contrary to the Christian faith. Et interrogati de sua fide & de Baptismo Parvulorum, & si salvabuntur per Baptismum, &c. And being askt of their faith, and concerning the Baptism of Children, if they should be saved by Baptism, and of the Reall presence in the Sacrament, and Penance &c. Responderunt; Quod de fide sua & de baptismo Parvulorum non dicent; neque dicere cogebantur: But they answered, concerning their faith, and about the Baptism of Children that they would say nothing; nor were they constrained to speak, &c. but about the Eucharist, Penance, and other things they spoke at large.*

*That to the examination and conviction of them, were called together a convention of divers Abbots, Bishops, Archbishops, 20 in number, and a very great Assembly: Toto ferè populo Albia & Lumberci presente, Almost all the people of Albia and Lumbercius being present (as saith our historian).*

*In which Assembly, they did, upon a fresh Examination and triall, convince and judg them guilty of Heresy in several Articles.*

*And, amongst the reit, for denying Infants-Baptism; and then, under that head as well as the reit, they gave them diverse Arguments to convince them of that Heresy viz. As first, because God would have all men to be saved, and, amongst the rest, Children. Secondly, because Baptism was given generally as well for the younger*



as Elder. Thirdly, because without Baptism, no salvation, as Jo. 3. 5. And Fourthly, because little Children were capable of the Kingdom of Heaven, for to such it doth belong. And Fifthly, Because concerning children it is said, as to malice be ye such; and, except ye be converted and become as little children &c. And therefore concerning the Apostles Baptizing them, Who ever doubted? And Sixthly that it came into the room of Circumcision, which was given to young and old; Baptism being more General, taking in the females as well as Males. And is administred, as the Church appoints, upon the faith of the God-father that offers them, as the Paralytick or the man sick of the palsy was by the faith of others, let down to Christ for cure; And the son of the Ruler and Daughter of the woman of Canan, by the faith of their Parents immediatly. Therefore, we say, that Baptism ought to be celebrated in the Church, and by the Ministers of the Church, except necessity prevent &c.

And, in the like method they went with them, to convince them of their sinful silence, not giving a free account of their faith being ask the same about Baptizing Infants &c. And concerning the Real presence, and Penance, they proceeded in like manner. And in the Conclusion, our Historian tells us, that the Hereticks seeing themselves converted and confounded did turn themselves to the People, and did say.

Audite, o bone viri, fidem nostram quam confitemur nunc propter amorem & gratiam vestram, &c. Hear, O ye People, our faith which now we confess for love to you and for your sakes. Where-

upon said the President, but is it not then for Gods sake? who thereupon were said to pronounce the following Creed (drawn up no question for them) viz. *Credimus etiam; Quia corde credimus, ore debemus confiteri*, We confess that, because we believe in heart, we ought to confess with the Mouth, —which was opposed to their silence.

*Credimus, Quia non salvatur qui non manducat corpus Christi, & quod corpus Christi non consecratur nisi in Ecclesiâ, & non nisi a sacerdote, sive bono sive malo, nec melius fieri per bonum quam per malum*; We believe that none is saved who eats not the body of Christ, and that the body of Christ is not consecrated, except in the Church, and not otherwise then by a Priest whether good or bad; Neither made better by a good then by a bad —opposed to their denying the Reall presence in the Eucharist after the priests consecration.

*Credimus etiam, quod non salvatur quis, nisi qui Baptizatur, & Parvulos salvari per Baptisma*. We believe also that none is saved that is not Baptized, and that Infants are saved by Baptism —opposed to their denying Infants Baptism.

And so about Penance and being Baptized in the Church by a Priest; which they read also as their belief, as is said.

After the Reading whereof, the President asks them if they would Swear to that faith that they held and believed the same; because they had so evilly thought and taught before in these particulars: to which 'tis said, *Respondentes dixerunt, Quod nullo modo jurarent*. They answering, saying, they would not swear by any means.

There-

Thereupon, the President in the name of the Council, told them, that they, having held such heretical opinions, ought to swear if they would testify Repentance; and that an oath ought to be, where the faith is in danger, and that Hereticks ought by oath to purge themselves, and to return to the unity of the Church and faith: and so to bind themselves thereto, as the Catholick Church holds and believes, lest the weak in the Church be corrupted and some scabbed sheep infect the whole flock: And that neither was it contrary to the Gospel to swear. That the Angel swore; the Apostles often swore; and that an Oath amongst men was an end of strife, &c. To which, the whole Council consented; Notwithstanding which, they refused to swear: thereupon, they adjudged them Hereticks, man by man, taking them out of the hands of the souldiers: but what became of them, is not mentioned.

Hereupon, we finde that Alexander the 3d, the then present Pope, did, about this time in 2 or 3 several Councils, make decrees against the *Albigensian-hereticks*, for denying Infants-Baptism, as you have it in the Treatise. p. 250, 251, 252.

Thus you have the substance of this most remarkable story; and the Confession of Faith, that Mr B. boasts of, and will needs father upon the *Waldenses*; and lays so much stress upon it also, as to enervate all that I had sayd to the contrary; to the rendring of me an Audacious calumniator. But whether upon due examination it doth not fully appear, that here is better evidence

Why these  
very Peo-  
ple were a-  
gainst In-  
fants-Bap-  
tism.

evidence for us, than against us ( so temerarious is he in his writings ! )

For, *first*, Is it not manifest, that these, called *Arrians* or *Manichees*, the *Bon-homes* or *Tholonians*, were certainly the *Waldenses* ? he himself granting them so to be, and therefore Quotes this story as belonging to them.

*Secondly*, That it is manifest, that they did deny *Infants-Baptism* as well as the *real presence* in the *Eucharist*, and *Penance*, &c. And that they did not only deny it to them for *Salvation*, but to all intents and purposes not only by refusing to answer that poynt but by the several *Arguments* the *Councell* used with them for their *Conviction* about it ; The Article of faith made to oppose it ; their charging it upon them again and again to have been of such an evil belief before ; & the *Decrees* that past by Pope *Alexander* the 3d against the *Waldenses* for the same.

*3dly*, That nothing is more clear than that this was a *Popish Confession*, made by the *Counsel*, and imposed upon them. Which though they might be forc't to read for the sake of the people, as they told them, and not for *Gods sake*, yet that they ownd it not, nor would swear to the same ; and for which they were judged *Heriticks*, notwithstanding any thing they might compel them to read as theirs.

*4ly*, That, in case they had through fear Recanted their former *profession* in all these *particulars* and subscribed and swore to this *Popish* confession ; Could we more judge all the *Waldenses* of this in, and than we might judg all the *Protestants*

stants in Q Maryes time were for the real pre-  
tence, because some, through fear, recanted  
their profession, and subscribed the *Popish* faith  
therein?

5/y, Whether it doth not call for *shame and*  
*tears*, To see Mr *Baxter's* great *unfaithfulness*  
and want of *Conscience*, to make such a positive  
and most notorious *Popish* confession about *Bap-*  
*tism*, to *Quadare* with a *Protestant* faith, the  
better to hide the *cheat*.

Therefore, with Mr *Baxter's* leave, I shall re-  
turn his own words upon himself, that he was  
pleased to give me in the case of the *Donatists*,  
p. 241 referring it to the Reader and his own  
conscience, To whom they most properly be-  
long? viz.

Mr Bagshaw is now quite over done in the qua-  
lity of untruths: Reader, either this man had seen  
and read *Windover's* book mention'd by him or he  
had not: If not, doth he use God's Church, and the  
souls of poor ignorant People with any tenderness  
of conscience, sobriety or humanity; to talk at this  
rate of Books that he never saw or Read, which are  
so common among us to be seen? If he understand  
not *Latine*, how unfit is he, to give us this story from  
*Hoveden* who wrote in *Latin*? And how audaci-  
ous, to talk thus of what he knoweth not? If he  
understand it; what cruelty is it to the Church to  
venture on such untruths, to save him the labour of  
opening and Reading the Book he talkes of? But if  
he have read it, then I can scarce match him among  
all the falsifiers, that I know in the world: I dare  
not be so uncharitable to him, as to think that ever  
he read it.

Mr *Bax-*  
ter's own  
words re-  
turn'd up-  
on himself.



## 2. Head.

*From their most eminent leading men, who witnessed against Infants-Baptism,*

**T**Hose great men amongst them that witnessed against Infants-baptism, mentioned by me, were *Berengarius, Peter Bruu, Henricus* and *Arnoldus*.

Mr B's  
Excepti-  
ons about  
Berenga-  
rius.

As to the famous *Eeringarius* : he sayth, *I do impenitently renew my slander* ; Yet [doth he acknowledge ] that he and his followers did maintain, That Baptism did not profit little ones to salvation ; and, that they did, as much as in them lay, endeavour to overthrow the Baptism of children, as he sayth *Guilmund and Durandus affirm, p. 385. And ( which he grants ) , that Wickliff, and the Waldenses did so also. p. 373. But enquires, why Berengarius is reckoned among the Waldenses, and severely reproves me for a gross misquotation ( as he will have it ) from Thuanus.*

Mr B.  
hath given  
up his  
Cause in  
this grant.

To all which I say, *first*, As to his acknowledgment ; it is very well we have so much granted ; which we may have occasion to put him in minde of, hereafter ; it being no less than a giving up his cause, as I have made appear before, in the case of the *Donatists* : there being no other ground pretended for it, either from *Scripture or Canon-Law*, but, the necessity of it to save Children, and take away their sin. And that therefore, as a necessary consequence, whoever deny'd it for *Salvation*, did not only deny *Infants-Baptism* ;

but,



but, as much as in them lay, wholly overthrow it, as they said, viz. raze out the ground and foundation thereof; that being the main and principal thing urged for it: and that, whoever did so, did not only despise *Austin*, and all the *Fathers* and *Doctors* of the Church after him, asserting the same; but brought themselves under the *Canonical Anathema's*; for *Hereticks*. Those other Groueds from *Federal-right*, and *holynesse*, *Infants discipleship* and *Church-Membership*, to baptize Children upon: being no more asserted in this *Age*, than 600 years before; nor, as far as I can yet learn, was known in the *World*, for scem: ages after, And which till (*Mr B.*) makes appear. I must tell him again, He has given up his cause, as I before made good to *Mr Wills* in my Reply p. 96. and to which *Mr B.* sayth nothing.

Secondly, as to his enquiry why *Beringarius* is reckoned as one of the *Waldenses*; he cannot but know, that persons were so esteemed that maintained that faith, and belief, that the *Waldenses* professed; and not barely, for being of the same *Country* and *Province* with them; for so, persons were called in all *Countrys* that own'd their *Religion*. And, that *Beringarius* professed the same faith concerning *Baptism* and the *Lords-supper*, in opposition to the *Church of Rome*, none doubts; being a *Neighbour* also to some of those parts of their *aboad*. And therefore it is that their *followers* in after-times interchangeably were called *Beringarians* and *Waldenses*, as *Bishop Ussher*, in the *state of the Church*, tells us. p. 238.

Why *Beringarius* is one of the *Waldenses*

Thirdly,

Mr B's  
four-fold  
charge  
with ag-  
gravation.

*Thirdly*, as to that most hainous and gross mistake he chargeth me with about *Thuanus*; it will, I presume, be found to be his own, with shame enough. Who tells us p. 377. that I say that *Thuanus* witnesseth that Bruno Arch-bishop of Triers did persecute Beringarius, for denying Infants-Baptism as p. 242. (2dly) that I did not tell where *Thuanus* saith so, as if they must read over 5 Volumes in folio, to be able to disprove such a tale-bearer as this. And (3dly), that I say, *Usher* saith so de Success. Eccles. p. 252. But all is false, *Usher's* words are in p. 207. and them also (as he saith) most horribly falsified; for, he speaks not there of Beringarius, that it was expelled out of his Diocesis; but of some of Beringarius followers who sow'd his Doctrine, &c. So that there is no talk of persecuting Beringarius but some of his followers; and not a word of Infants-Baptism. And then concludes thus. Was ever such a reporter as this man before taken for a Credible person? I confess I remember not that I ever read the like among Papists or any other Sect, which is a charge to the purpose, for what can well be said worse of any man; wherein we gather up this 4 fold accusation; First, for horribly falsifying *Thuanus* his words as reported by *Usher*. 2dly, falsifying *Usher's* quotation 252. for 207. 3dly for simply telling my tale not mentioning where *Thuanus* saith so. 4ly, that there is not a word of Infants-Baptism; therefore such a falsifyer he never met with nor read of amongst either Papists or others. But how I have deserved this severity, will speedily appear.

Know

Know therefore, The passage he Reflects upon, is, my 4th. proof to Mr Will's, why *Beringarius* opposed Infants-Baptism, p 116. of my Reply. My expresse words are these,

*Fourthly, From the Testimony of Thuanus, witnessing that Bruno Archbishop of Triers did persecute the Beringarians [not Beringarius] for denying Infants-Baptism, as you have it p. 242. 243. out of my Treat, viz. That, Thuanus witnesseth their persecution: And, that it was for denying Infants-Baptism you have it in the pages aforesaid; and that it is so; be pleased to take the words of the Treatise, p. 243.*

*Dr Usher tells us in the succession of the Church, p 252. out of Thuanus, that Bruno Archbishop of Triers, did expel several of the Beringarian Sect that had spread his Doctrine in several of those Belgick Countreys, and that several of them upon examination did say, that Baptism did not profit Children to salvation as saith he. (viz. Usher) the Author of the acts of Bruno (found in the Lord Carews Library of Clapton) doth testify.*

And, that I did not mistake Dr Usher, take them in his own words; which are these, as you'll finde them in the last Edition, printed at Hanow 1658. p. 252 ch. 7. sect. 37. viz. *Brunonem quoq; Trevirorum Archiepiscopum Diacesi sua expulsi se quosdam ex Beringarii sectatoribus, qui illius Doctrinam in Eubonibus & aliis Belgii populis disseminabant, narrat D. Thuanus Author actorum Brunonis (in Bibliotheca nobiliss. Baronis Carew de Clopton repertus) qui se huic examini interfuisse scribit, etiam baptismum periculis ad salutem*

What I  
sayd in my  
Reply.

1658

What I  
sayd in my  
Treat. from  
Bp. Usher.

own words

Præf. in  
Hist. sui  
temp. ad  
Reg. H. 4.

*salutem non perficere, istos dixisse ait.* So Bishop Usher joynes what *Thuanus* sayth of the Banishment of the *Beringarians*, and what on: present the eat delivers of the cause thereof, viz. for their holding, that Baptism did not proht little-ones to salvation; so making it all, as one story.

My ap-  
peal in the  
case

Therefore, by this full demonstration it will easily be judged 1<sup>st</sup>, Whether in my *Reply* to Mr *Wills* I did so far falsify *Thuanus*, as to say, He tells us *Beringarius* for *Beringarians*, as Mr *B.* flatly chargeth me with, and whether Mr. *B.* hath not made the very forgery himself & quarrells me for : 2<sup>dly</sup>, whether I falsify the p. in Usher 292. for 207. as he suggests : 3<sup>dly</sup>, whether in referring Mr *Wills* to *Thuanus*, ( for the persecution of the *Beringarian* sect by *Bruno* and for the cause thereof also, viz. *their denying Infants-Baptism* ) to my *Treatise*, where I had quoted both out of Usher as he put them together; was not a full reference, to discover the truth of both : 4<sup>ly</sup>, Whether, in referring to Usher, I did not refert to *Thuanus* his Preface also, so exprest in the *Margent*, to save Mr *B.* the labour of turning over 5 volumes in folio : and 5<sup>ly</sup>, Whether the word *Infants-Baptism* be not there also in Ushers quotation of the story to which I do relate, and Mr *B.* seems so positively to deny : 6<sup>ly</sup>, Whether, therefore I deserve to be esteemed such a *Reporter* and *falsifyer*, as never before was read of, or met with, either amongst *Papists* or others; as though none of their Popish *Legendaries* that he has read could equalize me : And 7<sup>ly</sup>, Whether Mr *B.* hath

hath not, in this very passage, given a substantial discovery of his spirit, and the manner of his heedless writing, and particularly his venomous unchristian (not to say, envious and malicious) intentions to my self: And lastly, Whether such dealing as this, doth not call for Repentance and due satisfaction, especially from him that exacts the utmost mite of this kinde from others; and to instruct him, To be more cautious and considerate in flying his fire-Balls, for time to come;

As to Peter Bruis, and Henry his Colleague, what I their witnessing, against Infants-Baptism; I say from made good, from Cluniacensis and Bernard's P. Bruis writings, contemporaries with them; and confirmed it also by some Modern writers, viz. Cassander, Vicecomes, and Dr. Hamond. And that Bruis and Arnold were censured for denying Infants-Baptism in the Lateran Council by Dr. Prideaux, that great Collector of the Councils, and searcher into Antiquity.

To all which M. B. saith, that he denies not that Peter Cluniacensis, and Bernard, do report that Bruis and Henricus did deny Infants-Baptism, as he grants their Epistles and Arguments against them for the same testify, being the most plausible, especially Bruis, of all my witnesses: And that Cassander from Cluni doth confirm it of Bruis, he confesseth, but slighter Vicecomes as a Calumniator, though a man of great Learning, and Repute amongst the Papish writers; and often quoted by Bishop Dyer, and other learned men, as a great Collector of Antiquity, especially about  
H their

What of  
Bruis and  
Hen. he  
grants,  
and what  
he cavils  
at.



And as to Dr Hammond, whom I have only quoted Mr. Tombes his Review for not the Drs. own writings;

Which for his better satisfaction he will find in his defence of Infants Baptism, ch. 1. sect. 2 p. 7. And which grant from so considerable an adversary and so learned a man is not proof to be scorned, as Mr. B. is pleased to do, As for what I say from Dr. Prideaux testimony, that in the 2d. Lateran Council, Pet. Erab, and Arnold, were censured for the heresy of Rejecting Infants Baptism &c.

Mr. Baxter's great ignorance and unfaithfulness.

He saith p. 385. &c. that there is not the least proof of any such matter, met with in that Council. At that Pet. Erab doth not so much as name that Council, Ay that Binus only tells you, that the Acts of the Council are not extant; But, that Abbas Urspergens and Otto Putschigenis give us some account of what they did; whose words have not a syllable about any such subject, but only that they condemned the Schismaticks who adhered to Peter Leo, an Anti-pope; and truly this Dr. Prideaux book being printed after his death, though it is said so, yet he doth presume, he would not have owned such a piece of forgery; which Erab and Binus reject or take as false.

Wherein, we have a further proof of this mans reading, and his skill in history which he would make us believe is so great; but especially of his unfaithful dealing with Authors, and how he is to be credited for time to come in his quotations.

He





now at years of discretion could be seduced by Christs-  
Baptism, and that the faith of another could not  
profuse them, who can exercise none of their own; and  
that Arnold of Brixia; follow'd these his errors,  
Out of Bernard 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>d</sup> Epist. and Glan. Ep.  
11 And further, concerning Arnoldus he tells us  
that Otto Frisingensis testify'd thus; that, in this  
Council, amongst other things, an accusation was  
exhibited against Arnold of Brixia, a new heretick,  
and Disciple of Peter Abilardus. Otto Frisingensis  
de Reb. gest. Imper. Fred. 12. Lib. 2. c. 20.

23 Canon  
damn  
those that  
deny In-  
fants-Bap-  
tism.

And then giving an account of the Canons  
themselves, tells us, that the 2<sup>d</sup> Canon doth expel  
out of the Church, and damn as hereticks, those who  
deny Infants-Baptism, &c. *Eas qui Baptismum  
puerorum damnant.*

And further gives us an account of the Decretal  
Epistle, that at this time was written by this  
P. In. 2. directed to Bernard abbot of Clavach,  
and the Archbishops of Rheims and Sens, about  
Arnoldus. The words are these.

In 2<sup>d</sup> de-  
cree Ep. a-  
gainst  
Arnol-  
dus, &c.

By these presents, written to your Fraternity,  
We require forasmuch as Peter Abilard and Ar-  
noldus of Brixia, the fathers of perverse opini-  
ons and impugnors of the Catholick faith, That in  
such Religious places as seeme you best, you do par-  
ticularly make a steele (or check) to those opinions.  
And that you cause to be burnt all their erroneous  
books where ever you may finde them. Dated 7.  
Kalend. of Aug. 2. All which we have also in  
Binis 2<sup>d</sup> Edition.

I finde also the very same Preamble, Canon,  
and Decretal Epistle, in the Collectia Regia, that  
great

great collection of Councils in 37 volumes and in Longus his *Suprema concitionum omnium* p. 88. as also in *Coffarius* Tom. 10. p. 999. Therefore what cause Mr B. had to be so positive that there is not the least proof for any such matter medled with in this Council; when so much proof appears for it, is to be considered.

And that he should so peremptorily assert, that *Binius* should say that the Acts of that Council are not extant, when he sayth the quite contrary in both his Editions, and doth not only give you the Acts of the Council, but the Preamble thereto, and the decretal Epistle following it, is matter of admiration!

And, that *Frisirigenis* hath not a syllable about any such subject, viz. about *Arnold's* censuring, when it is so expressly mention'd from him; What did the man mean? And why he should pretend all this to be forgery, and perswade us, they were foisted into Dr. *Prideaux's* history after his death, which he would not have owned had he been living; is all to be recommended to his better consideration for his humbling, and that he will learn more modesty, and be more careful to write the truth for time to come, and not to write hand over head whatever comes to his mind, in this shamfull manner.

Then further, about *Cluniacensis* writing about *Brus* &c. he saith, these things, 1st that *Chini*: Mr B's allegations against *Brus* his Testimony in 4 particulars  
who gives this account of *Brus*, wrote 20 years after he saw'd his Doctrine; implying therefore, that what he had from him was but by uncertain hearsay, and from no certain proof: 2dly, that, as to *Henricus*,

vicious, he declares; that he had not attained know-  
 ledge of his Doctrine; 3dly, that if true as reported  
 of them, that they did deny Infants-Baptism, it  
 follows not, that the Waldenses did so, but that  
 they themselves were some of the wicked Mani-  
 chees, that did so, and not the Waldenses. 4ly.  
 that if Cluni and Bernards reports must be credi-  
 ted for their denying Infants-Baptism, must they  
 not also be believed for their denying Infants Sal-  
 vation also, and that they were wicked and vici-  
 ous persons, which Bernard especially testifies of  
 Henricus.

*Answer.* To the 1st. that Cluni wrote 20 years after  
 Bruns had sow'd his Doctrine; if he mean, as  
 he would insinuate, from his beginning so to do;  
 it is more then he can make good: other wise, if  
 he mean [ presently after he was burnt ] it can  
 import nothing of what he would inerr: for so,  
 he might be his contemporary all along from the  
 beginning of his preaching; which is all that I  
 think can be gathered from Clunies words, who  
 tells us in his 1st. Ep. *Anno porro circiter viginti,*  
*Petrus de Bruns publica voce in eiusmodi res in-*  
*vultus est,* &c. that Peter Bruns did for the space of  
 20 years, publicly hold out his Doctrines, & parti-  
 cularly that he preached in a publique place in Tho-  
 louse, and that he fill'd Gascony, and all the parts  
 about it with his errors. So that by what here is  
 said Bruns and Cluni might very well live toge-  
 ther in the same time, and by his being so pub-  
 like in his preachings, he need not want certain  
 evidence of his Doctrines.

Secondly, That what Mr. B. saith as to Cluni's  
 wanting

wanting certain knowledge of *Henry's Doctrine*, and that, what he had thereof, was but by hearsay; it is a good Argument that he had certain knowledge, of what he says concerning *Bruis*. Though, as to *Henry's Doctrine*, he tells us in his 12. Ep. *ab ore ejus excepto dicebatur scriptum vidi non quinque sed plura capitula &c.* That is, he had seen a writing, said to be taken from his own Mouth, which holds forth not 5. but more heads (behaving reduc'd *Peter's* 10. 5. heads.)

But if *Cluni* had not so good knowledge of *Henry's Doctrine*; *Bernard* tells us he had: who gives us an account of 11 Articles of them. The denying of *Infants-Baptism* being the first, and in his 65 Sermon he saith thus of them: *Hec dogmata excepta esse partim per investigationem, partim parsonis altercantibus audita, partim prodita ab iis qui ad Pontificiam Ecclesiam redierunt.* Which Dogmata, he saith, he obtained partly by investigation or diligent search, partly by personal disputation, and partly by some who had left them and returned to their Church.

Thirdly, that as to *Peter Bruis* his denying *Infants-Baptism*, it is confirmed not only by this double testimony from these 2 great men of this age *Cluni* and *Bernard*, and the concurring testimony of so many Learned men confirming the same, viz. that he not only deny'd *Infants* to be Baptized to save them, but they ought not to be Baptized at all. And that none ought to be Baptized by the faith of another, thereby denying God-Fathers or Parents to undertake for them to that end; nor any till they were of age.



& able to make out personal faith from Christ's Commission *Math. 28.* And that, if any were Baptized in *Infancy* they were to be Baptized at age which was not to be esteemed Re-baptization but right Baptism: all which you have in *Cluni's* Epistle, which would be worth your sight at large, and which, if opportunity may permit, I shall give you in the Conclusion.

And, what a friend he was to Infants-Baptism, may also be found in that excellent Treatise of his concerning *Anti-Christ*, wherein he tells us as *Treat. p. 240. and 334.* That *Anti-Christ* grounds all Christianity and Religion in the Baptizing of Children, attributing Regeneration and salvation to that outward work done, so contrary to the holy spirit; And that humane Traditions are to be esteemed *Anti-Christian* abominations. There being nothing for Infants-Baptism as Mr. B. tells us, the Papists and many Protestants hold but humane Tradition (though it is true, he says he is of another mind).

And that *He* and *Henry* were *Waldenses* and not wicked *Manichees* ) as Mr. B. would vilely insinuate); Let their own historian *Perin* tell us, who giving an account of their most eminent ding men and famous *Barbes* or Ministers from their ancient Records, saith thus, Chapter 9. p. 64. *De mesme pas survit Pierre Bruis donc plusieurs les nommerent Pierre-Brusiens auquel (ad-jouste-il) succeda en Doctrine un nomme Henri disquel on avoit este Prestre & l'autre Moine & Enseignerent es Eglises d'Arles D'Ambrun de Da de Gap ou en d'autres chastes ils furent recens a Thoulouze.*



Lonze. viz. At the same time followed Pet. Bruis, whereupon many called them (viz. the Waldenses) Petro-brusians. (Cluniacensis writings are Contra Petrobrusianos.) To whom there succeeded in Doctrine one Henry; the one having been a Priest, the other a Monk; and they taught in the Bishoprick of Arles, Ambrun, Die, and Gap; from whence being chased away, they were received at Tholouse.

And concerning whom Cluni: tells us in his Epistle, *Fuerunt homines, non indocti neque ab omni pietate alieni*, That they were men neither unlearned, nor strangers to piety, viz. That they were both learned and in their conversations honest and good men.

So that this may satisfy that they were not only Waldenses, but men of so much worth and fame amongst them, that the Waldenses their brethren bore their names. And, that they were free from such wicked scandals as Bernards reporters would cast upon them as denyers of meates and mariages, &c. Cluni: himself acquits them, in his 2d Ep. viz. *Sacerdotes & Monachos ab iis compulsos ait Uxores ducere, carnes coxisse, & ipso passionis Dominica die Paschalem dominicam precedente, invitatis publicè ad esum populis, comedisse*, viz. That they constraynd both Priests and Monkes to marry, did boyl flesh and upon good Fryday it self did feast the people. And Alphonsus de Castro to the same purpose advers. Hæres. l. 4. de cibo. *Tempore quadragesimæ, carnem & ova & reliqua prohibita comedebant, dicentes Nullum esse peccatum hoc facere*; that they eat both

beast flesh and eggs and other prohibited things in Lent, saying, It is no sin, so to do. And as to the foundation of Manichaeism and other immunities they cast upon them and their party; I shall presently unridle and clear them off from their own pens.

Fourthly, As to their denying Infants Salvation, which they say they held as well as their Baptism, and which we are to believe in one as well as the other; it was but a pretended consequence they drew upon their doctrine from their own mistaken principles, concluding from Jo. 3. 5. that none were to be saved without it, according to the opinion of the Fathers, decrees of Councils, and faith of the Church; and therefore, for them to deny them Baptism either for want of personal faith, or upon the faith of others, was certainly to deny them the means of salvation; so much for our men of name, viz. Beringarius, Bruis and Henry, who as yet, without dispute, did deny Infants-Baptism; all cavills being answered and removed.

And as to the famous Arnoldus, who was censured in the Lateran Council for the heresy, of denying Infants-Baptism, Church buildings, and the adoration of the Cross; and afterwards in the year 1155. hang'd and burnt at Rome, as sayth Gerbodus, as also Bernard Ep. 196 189. 195. Baron. Annals. 1139. 1145. Num. 3. The Waldenses bearing his name for many ages, as sayth Dr Usher and Perin; Mr B. takes no notice of him.

But, before we go off from this head, we must take notice of Mr Baxter's great dissingenuity.

Instead

Instead of reproving Mr Will, for his false, unfaithful passage about *Pet. Bruis*, he doth what he can to palliate and justify by his partial return he gives to that my just reproof for his most notorious abuse therein.

Mr B's great unfaithfulness in justifying not condemning Mr W's unrighteousness concerning Cluni.

Who told us positively, that *Osiander* took those 5 particulars out of *Cluni's* own writings which he charged upon *Pet. Bruis*, viz. For denying Baptism, Resurrection, the Divinity of Christ, forbidding of meats, and to have all things Common; and that, If I would give credit to *Cluni* in one, I should believe him in the other also; but that I should rather blush to introduce such a popish Calumniation from such a lying Abbot.

Which I detected at large, proving, 1. That *Osiander* says no such thing, viz. that he took those particulars out of *Cluni's* own writings; but that *Osiander* sayth, those particulars with 20 more were charged not upon *Pet. Bruis* but the *Albigois*, not by *Cluni* but by *Sabellius* and *Schedlius*; and taken, not out of *Cluni's* writings but out of *Lucilburgius*, *Antonius*, *Vincentius*, &c. And not in *Cluni's* time but in the Century after. And that what *Osiander* sayth, *Cluni* charged *Bruis* with, was of another nature, and for nothing but for denying popish Doctrines in 15. particulars.

But sayth Mr B. with his daubery 1. how doth he prove that *Cluni* hath no more then 15? It is enough that *Osiander* mentions not more, he sayth *Osiander* mentions these 5. from him which is false.

2dly, sayth Mr B. Doth that prove Mr Wills knew it? Yes, because he saith that *Osiander* tells

tells us, he took those 5 particulars out of *Cluni's* own writings when he must needs know that *Osiander* sayth, he took them elsewhere.

But 3ly, *How did I know that he ever saw Cluni?* It is enough, that he saw *Osiander* whom he quotes with so much confidence, citing those 5 particulars in *Osiander's* own words in Latin.

And 4ly, *How did I know Peter Bruis was dead long before such accusations?* Did not Bernard charge some of these things?

I know, this being in the 13th Century, that *Osiander* mentions, and that *P. Bruis* lived in the beginning of the 12. *Cent.* and therefore must be dead long before these things charg'd by *Schedelins*, &c. upon the *Albigois*; And, for those lying reports, Bernard mentions of the *Henrici*, it is nothing to this purpose: He sayth they were taken out of *Cluni's* writings and charged expressly upon *Pet. Bruis*.

Therefore let Mr B. blush that instead of reproving such notorious forgery & impiety, shall thus set his wits on the tenter, to mince, hide, and cover the same; but what will not men do that are engaged in all ill cause to justify themselves therein.

3. *Head.*

*From the evidence of it from many learned men  
(some of whom opposed them in it) and Decrees  
of Councils against them for it.*

The Lear-  
ned Wri-  
ters testi-  
fying it.

Some of the *Authorities* produced by me from the learned ancient Writers in the 12 and 13. Centuries, to prove this truth besides *Clu-  
macensis* and *Bernard*, were from *Eckbertus*,  
*Erberardus*, *Rainerius*, *Durandus*, The Author  
of the acts of *Bruno*, *Ermingardus*, with some  
eminent *Chronologers*, viz. *Hovedens An-  
nals*, *Pithaus French History*, *Papir Masson's  
Annals*, *Casarius Hissarback*, *Tavins History of  
Navar*, *Ardens Homil.*

Some of whom he takes notice of and others  
he doth not, and as to what I mention from  
*Pithaus Masson*, and *Arden*, he saith, that 1<sup>st</sup>  
they speak only concerning their denying *Baptism*,  
and that is not *Infants-baptism*: 2<sup>dly</sup>. That these  
they speak of, are the *Manichees*, and what is that  
to the *Waldenses*? and that *Eckbertus* who speaks  
of some that deny *Infants-baptism*, he calls them  
*Manichees* and that *Erhardus*, and *Ermingardus*,  
do not otherwise affirm any to deny it, or oppose them  
for it, but as they are *Manichees*, denying with it  
*Marriage*, *Resurrection*, &c.

And that, though *Rainerius* testifieth that the  
*Waldenses* do say that *Baptism* profits not little  
ones; it is only to be understood in a *Popish* sense.

To which I reply: First, as to the *Exception*  
he makes to those that testify, that some denied  
*baptism*



They that deny'd Infants-baptism were said to deny baptism.

And 2dly.

That the Waldenses were called Manichees, and why?

And 2dly.

That the Waldenses were these supposed Manichees who denied Infants-Baptism, but not those other things layd to their charge viz. Marriage, Meats, Resurrection, &c; is my next Task.

And therefore,

because Mr. B. layes so much stress upon it, we must crave the Reader's patience, to be more particular about it; and the rather, because he in so many places acknowledges that the *Manichees* did deny it; so that if we make it good that they were *Waldenses* so called, and not another people dwelling amongst them as is supposed by some, we have another good grant from Mr. B. himself.

Therefore not to insist upon it, whether there was such a one as *Manes* (in the 3d. Century, as *Eusebius* tells us, from whom some supposed the name came); All agree that the *Manichees* Herefy were no other then the *Pharisees*, or the sect of the Mad men, known also by the names *Callants* and *Pharisees*, viz. *Pharisees* and *Publicans*.

And 2dly.

That the Waldenses were these supposed Manichees who denied Infants-Baptism, but not those other things layd to their charge viz. Marriage, Meats, Resurrection, &c; is my next Task.

And therefore,

because Mr. B. layes so much stress upon it, we must crave the Reader's patience, to be more particular about it; and the rather, because he in so many places acknowledges that the *Manichees* did deny it; so that if we make it good that they were *Waldenses* so called, and not another people dwelling amongst them as is supposed by some, we have another good grant from Mr. B. himself.

Therefore not to insist upon it, whether there was such a one as *Manes* (in the 3d. Century, as *Eusebius* tells us, from whom some supposed the name came); All agree that the *Manichees* Herefy were no other then the *Pharisees*, or the sect of the Mad men, known also by the names *Callants* and *Pharisees*, viz. *Pharisees* and *Publicans*.

And 2dly.

That the Waldenses were these supposed Manichees who denied Infants-Baptism, but not those other things layd to their charge viz. Marriage, Meats, Resurrection, &c; is my next Task.

And therefore,

because Mr. B. layes so much stress upon it, we must crave the Reader's patience, to be more particular about it; and the rather, because he in so many places acknowledges that the *Manichees* did deny it; so that if we make it good that they were *Waldenses* so called, and not another people dwelling amongst them as is supposed by some, we have another good grant from Mr. B. himself.

Therefore not to insist upon it, whether there was such a one as *Manes* (in the 3d. Century, as *Eusebius* tells us, from whom some supposed the name came); All agree that the *Manichees* Herefy were no other then the *Pharisees*, or the sect of the Mad men, known also by the names *Callants* and *Pharisees*, viz. *Pharisees* and *Publicans*.

And 2dly.

That the Waldenses were these supposed Manichees who denied Infants-Baptism, but not those other things layd to their charge viz. Marriage, Meats, Resurrection, &c; is my next Task.

And therefore,

because Mr. B. layes so much stress upon it, we must crave the Reader's patience, to be more particular about it; and the rather, because he in so many places acknowledges that the *Manichees* did deny it; so that if we make it good that they were *Waldenses* so called, and not another people dwelling amongst them as is supposed by some, we have another good grant from Mr. B. himself.

Therefore not to insist upon it, whether there was such a one as *Manes* (in the 3d. Century, as *Eusebius* tells us, from whom some supposed the name came); All agree that the *Manichees* Herefy were no other then the *Pharisees*, or the sect of the Mad men, known also by the names *Callants* and *Pharisees*, viz. *Pharisees* and *Publicans*.

And 2dly.

That the Waldenses were these supposed Manichees who denied Infants-Baptism, but not those other things layd to their charge viz. Marriage, Meats, Resurrection, &c; is my next Task.

And therefore,

because Mr. B. layes so much stress upon it, we must crave the Reader's patience, to be more particular about it; and the rather, because he in so many places acknowledges that the *Manichees* did deny it; so that if we make it good that they were *Waldenses* so called, and not another people dwelling amongst them as is supposed by some, we have another good grant from Mr. B. himself.



Ch. 2. Sect. 5. *Witnesses justified.* 221

*Publicans.* And we find that those professors called the *Priscilianists*, *Messalian*, *Donatists*, and *Novatians*, were called by these names in the 4th. and 5th. Centuries. And as Dr. Usher tells us p. 288. out of Jer. 22. *Ep. ad Eustochium*, that Jerom observed in his day, that if a man looked seriously they would call him a miserable *Manichee*. *Si quem vidissent palentem atque tristem; miserum Manicheum vocabant.* And these were the very names they attributed to the *Waldenses* and their followers in after Centuries. Therefore *Perin* c. 3. p. 9. 10. tells us. *Quelque fois pour les rendre plus execrable ils les vendoient complices des Anciens Heretiques & neanmoins sous de pretexts ridicules, Car d'autant qu'ils fai soient profession de pureté en leur vie & croyence ils les appelloient Cathares.* Sometimes, to make them more odious, they made them considered as with ancient Hereticks, but yet under more then ridiculous pretences: for, because they made profession of purity in their lives, and of faith, they called them *Catharists*.

Secondly, that the opinions they feigned and fathered upon them, were agreeable to the name; we shall in the next place give you some account and therein shall shew you the Harmony those opinions they attributed to the *Waldenses* (the *New Manichees*), had with the opinions they ascribed to the old; which will fully evince the truth of the business.

In the first place the old *Manichees* were said to hold two Principles or beings, or two Gods; *Two esse principia inter se contraria (seu duos deos,*

The opinions fathered upon the old & new *Manichees* compared.

unum bonum malum alterum) : Taken, as the *Magdeburgs* tells us, out of *Origen's Peri Archon* and *Casarius Cent.* 13. c. 5. p. 554.

The same Heresy was also attributed to our new *Manichees* the *Waldenses*, viz. the holding of 2 Beings or Principles, and the ground thereof you have also in *Perin*, p. 10. viz. *Et quand ils soustenoynt que l'autorité des Emperours & Rois de la terre, ne depend point de l'autorité des Papes il's les ont appellez Manichees comme constituens deux principes*; And because they maintained that the Authority of Emperours & Kings depends not upon the Authority of the Pope they called them *Manichees* as appoynting two principles. And of the rise of which calumny he also tells us, p. 25. viz. *L'origine de ceste calumnie se trouue en l'extravagance du Pape Boniface. 8. qui assuiettissant l'autorité des Emperours a la sienne dit de la sienne. Quicunque huic potestati resistit, Dei ordinationi resistit; nisi duo (sicut Manicheus) fingat esse principia Can. un sanct. Li. Tom. 8.* The beginning of this Calumny was taken out of the Extravagants of Pope Boniface the 8 who subjecting the Authority of Emperours unto his, sayth of his own Authority; Who ever resisteth his authority resisteth the Ordinance of God unless they feign two principles, as the *Manichees* did.

The reason of the calumny.

When first arose.

How the *Waldenses* free from it.

2. To deny the Divinity of Christ & why?

As to the *Waldenses* Orthodox faith and firm belief of the only true God, maker of Heaven and Earth, &c. *Per. ch. 19. p. 87.* at large, which we need not mention. The second opinion they charged the Old *Manichees* with, was, that Christ was not God.

Christum

*Christum non esse Deum.* And which our new *Manichees* were also charged with, denying, with the the *Arrians*, the divinity of Christ, as *Perin* tells us, *viz. Et parce qu'ils n'osent que l'hostie que le prestre monstrea la messe soit dieu ils les ont appelez. Arrens comme n'ians la divinite du fils de dieu eternelle.* And because they deny'd the bread which the priest shew'd in the *Mafs* to be God, they called them *Arrians*, as denying the divinity of the eternal son of God. Of whose firm belief of Christ's Divinity you have a large account in their Ancient confession of faith, extracted, by *Charles Molins* by *Perin Chap. 13. p. 87, &c.*

• A 3d Heretical opinion fathered upon the old *Maniches*, was that they slighted the old Testa-  
ment. *Vetus testamentum repudiant*, The same  
also is given to our new ones, Because they deny'd the *Apocrypha* writings, and the whole *Oe-*  
conomy of the Romish Church, which they fetcht  
not so much from the new as the old Testament-  
rites, as high Priest, Altar, sacrifice, Temples,  
Priests, Tythes, Ephods, Singing-service, &c.

Of whose firm belief of the Old and new Testament their ancient confession fully demon-  
strates *Per. p. 79.* where all the Canonical Books  
are particularly mention'd; And which calumny  
some of their enemyes themselves refute: *Rai-*  
*nerius* confessing thus, *Quia novum & verum Te-*  
*stamentum vulgariter transulerunt, & sic docent,*  
*& discunt, That they translate the Old and New*  
*Testament, and so teach, and so learn; in his 3d*  
*Ch. of Heresie.*

3. To  
slight the  
Old Te-  
stament,  
and why?

4 That  
Baptism  
profits not  
and why?

A fourth opinion fathered upon the old *Manichees*, was, that water-baptism profits not to salvation, *Baptismum in aquâ nihil cuiquam perhibent salutis adferre.*

The like was fathered upon the *Waldenses* our new *Manichees*, because they denied, that *Baptism* profited little ones to salvation, therefore they denied water-baptism as before. Though their ancient confessions of faith before given, and their known practise fully refutes that calumny, *Pet. p. 89. c. 13.*

5 Deniers  
of marriage,  
and  
why?

A fifth is their denying of *Marriage*, and living *unchastely*, *Matrimonium damnabant, &c.* The like they attributed to our new ones, as before shewed, because they denied marriage to be a *Sacrament*.

The holy  
living of  
the *Waldenses*  
proved.

And as to their chaste and holy living, you need go no further for a Testimonial then to some of their worst Enemies. *Rauerus* their bloody Inquisitor in his *de forma Heret. fol. 98.* saith, *that they lived very Religiously in all things, their manners well seasoned; and their words wise and polished; by their mills always speaking of God and his Saines, perswading to vertue and to hate sin, &c.* And further as to this of their chastity and holy living, you have at large in the *Treat. p. 343. 344. 345.*

6 Denied  
meats.

A 6th. opinion, charged upon the old *Manichees*, was, that they refused to eat flesh, *Carnibus non vescuntur.*

The like was charged upon our new *Manichees*, and upon pretence thereof some of them were put to death, as *Bish. Usher* in the *state of the Church*

Church p. 281. tells us. But how groundless that Calumny was, you have already heard.

A 7th, That the old *Manichees* denyd the Resurrection; *Corporum Resurrectionem tanquam fabulam rejiciunt.* 7. Denied the Resurrection.

The like they attributed to our new ones, because they would make them compleat *Manichees*, and take all in; but, how maliciously and falsely, their confessions of faith fully discover.

By which parallell, you see that the *Waldenses* are feigned to hold the same opinions that they fathered upon the *Manichees* of old (viz. the Christians they called so). But for my own part, I believe the one was as true as the other, all being calumnyes; to be sure, as to the latter they were nothing but malicious mischievous Forgeryes. The Papiſts as *Virſi* tells us, *Lib. 4. c. 13.* charging them with the same Crimes that the ancient *Pagans* did the *Christians*, viz. with putting out of Candles, and killing their own Children in their assemblies.

And being put into these bears-skins, as you have heard, and called *Manichees*, and charged therefore with all those monstrous opinions, they made *Laws, Statutes, and decrees* against them as such, and so persecuted, imprisoned, and put them to death, as such: of which Bishop *Uſher* in his state and succession of the Church, gives us diverse instances, especially in his 8. ch. in most of his sections, too many here to relate, viz. that some were hanged, some burnt, diverse banished for holding these *Manichean Tenets* (thus fictitiously laid to their charge) and how  
F 2 (they



they could rejoyce, as having all manner of evil falsely layd to their charge, for Christs name sake.

And that they were *Waldenses* (and not another people as some vainly imagined) that were so called; nothing is more cleare: for, you'll find that *Emericus* in his *Director* part.2. Q. 13. calls them *Manichees*, whom *Rainarius* and *Perpintonus*, and others call *Cathari* and *Publicani* or *Paulicani*, the certain names of the *Waldenses*. And whereof we might give you diverse instances, but let one serve for all, given us by Mr. B. himself from our English *Windover* in the instance before cited viz. Those *Bon-homes*, *Thoulousians*, or *Waldenses*, are also by *Windover* called *Arians* or *Manichees* for the Reason before given, because they denyd the reall presence in the *Eucharist*, and Bishop *Usher* p. 294. speaking of that very passage out of *Hoveden*, saith, that *Grecesius* tells us that they were no other, as certainly proved, than *Waldenses*, though by their adversariyes called *Arrian* or *Manicheean* Hereticks, as their accusation, as he saith, makes manifest.

And such *Manichees* were *Brus*, *Henricus*, *Arnoldus*, and others that suffered under such Nick-names and reproaches such were the *Waldenses* their Bretheren, and so they are called in diverse decrees made against them, and such are many of the New late Puritans and Phanaticks, the *Cathari* and *Manichees* of our days.

It is true B. *Usher* that derived the Protestant Church in a line of succession from the *Waldenses* in

in oppottion to the Papicy, would fain have delivered them from the supposed scandal of denying *Infants-Baptism* with them also, ( which Mr B. would improve from him ) because he knew the *Manichees* so call'd did ( by such a pretence as this ) expressely deny it; but 'tis a subterfuge, you see, that will afford them no relief; And therefore all those instances given by the Bishop which Mr B. takes notice of, and leaneth so much upon will not avail, telling us that the *Manichees* were a distinct people from the *Waldenses*; because they came out of the *East*, and had been inhabitants in *Asia*, and also in *Bulgaria* and *Dalmatia*, *Lambardy*, &c. and that from those parts they had spread themselves amongst the *Waldenses* even to *Gascoyne* and those *Provinces* where the most of them inhabited, and so mingling amongst them they came to be esteem'd one and the same people, whereas they were different; Whereas they were certainly no other then the *Waldenses* themselves, viz. men of the same principles, faith, and practise with them, viz. those that lived in these remote countreys; as well as those that came from those parts into *France*; which is abundantly cleared to us by *Perin*. Ch. 7. p. 244. *Le Moyne Rainerius en son livre*, &c. *The Monk Rainerius in his book of his form of proceedings against the Hereticks in that Catalogue he made of the Churches of the Waldenses or poor people of Lyons*, Notes, that there were in his time, that is to say, in the year 1250. Churches of them in *Constantinople*, *Philadelphia*, *Sclavonia*, *Bulgaria*, and *Digonicia*.

The Bulgarian Manichees were Waldenses.

And that *Math. Paris* sayth in the life of H. 6. That they were long since in Croatia and Dalmatia.

And that they inhabited in Italy, *Rainerius* further sayth, p. 240. c. 16. that about the year 1250. The Waldenses had Churches in Albania, Lumbardy, Millan, & in Romagna, as also in Venice, Florence and Valspoletine; as also in Sicily.

—And that *Gregory the 9th*, and *Honorius*, did persecute them in Italy, under the name of Fraticelli. That the Emperour *Fredric. 2d.* persecuted and condemned them, all his Empire through, by the names of *Gazaros*, *Patarenos*, *Leonistas*, *Arnoldistas*.

By which you see they were but one and the same people, that inhabited all these Countreys, viz. people of the same faith, Doctrine and practise; The *Magdeburg's* Cent. 13. c. 9. p. 554. Tells us out of *Sabellicus* Tom. 2. &c. *Primum quidem capit ista Hæresis Roma—Quædam autem à Manichæis eos sumpsisse ferunt.* Some think this heresy began at Rome, others to have taken their Original from the Manichees; the truth of both is easily reconciled when it is considered that their doctrine was one and the same with the *Novatians*, who were banished Rome, in *Innocent's* first time, and so were dispersed some into Lumbardy, and some into Dalmatia, who were called *Manichees*, and *Cathari*; and whose very doctrines were spread all these Countreys through, as *Rainerius* informs us.

I have been the larger to clear this poynt, because it is of so much weight respecting our  
Waldensian

Whence the Waldenses called Manichees, and from whence they came.

*Waldensian* witness; Mr B. laying so much stress upon it, *acknowledging* so fully that the *Manichees* that lived amongst them, did indeed deny *Infants-Baptism*, but the *Waldenses* did not; whereas from all this undeniable evidence, they were but one and the same people agreeing in one and the same doctrine and practise.

As to that other part of this evidence, viz. from the decrees of Kings and Councils (whereof I mention'd 12. which sentenc'd them for denying *Infants-Baptism*); he only sayth thus, p. 395.

That they denied *Infants-Baptism* appears from the Decrees of Councils.

He soundeth his proof of 12. decrees and endeth with an insultation against me and others. Which is all the notice he is pleased to take of them. But whether he ought not to give us a better answer, let the Reader judge; especially when he hears some of the same decrees: Of which you may take 2 or 3. of them, for better information.

Alexander the 3d Anno. 1179. In the 27. Canon of his Lateran Council, condemns the *Waldensian* or *Catharian* hereticks, dwelling in Gascoyne, Albi, and other parts about Tholouse, and amongst the rest for denying *Baptism* to Children. Treat. 252.

Alex. 3. Later. Council.

Innocent the 2d, Anno. 1136. in the 2d. Lateran Council, condemns Arnoldus, from whom the *Waldenses* were called *Arnoldists*, for denying *Infants-Baptism*, Treat. 246.

In 2. Later. Council.

Innocent the 3d, in his decretal Epist. to the Bishop of Arles, inveighs against the heresy of the *Arelatenses* or *Waldenses* for denying of *Infants-Baptism*, which he therefore established by his decree.

In 3. Decree.

are, To save them, and to take away original sin; and which sayth *Baronius*, recording the same, *Innocent* wrote against the *Albigensian Anabaptists* *Treat.* 253. We might mention the rest, but let these suffice.

Mr *Marshall* in his defence of Infants-Baptism p. 63. sayth thus, I shall desire you to shew, That any company or sect (if you will so call them) have denyd' d Infants-Baptism; produce, if you can, any of their confessions; alledge any Acts of any Councils where this doctrine was charged upon any, and condemned in that Council.

#### 4 Head.

The 4th. Demonstration was from the footsteps the Waldenses had left hereof in diverse Countreyes and Regions where they and their doctrines were dispersed.

OF which, Instances were given from the Churches in Germany, Switzerland, Flanders, Holland, Bohemia, Hungaria, Transylvania, Poland, England; and there, under these 4 denominations, Waldenses, Lollards, Wickliffians and Anabaptists; as appears by instances through all the Kings Reignes since the Conquest. p. 275. to 310.

To none of which Mr. B. gives us the least return, or one exception: only singles out Wickliff, from whom were the Wickliffists; as supposing he has advantage given by him to refute all the rest. And what his exceptions are about him



him, we shall impartially weigh and consider; but, in the mean time, it must be remembered, that all the rest stand for firm and good proof, till Mr. B. or some body else, discovers to us the contrary.

*John Wickliff's witness against Infants-Baptism vindicated from Mr. Baxters abuses and injurious cavills.*

To the making our story about *John Wickliff* *Wickliff* compleat, I shall first evidence to you that he was of the *Waldensian* faith; which you will find he received from the *Lollards*, so called in *England*, from *Raimond* or *Walter Lollard*, the great *Waldensian* *Barbe*, who was so instrumental in these Nations, of which *Perin* in his *History of the Vandois*, p. 235. gives us this particular account ( which I have not before mentioned, )

*Wickliff*  
one of the  
*Lollards* or  
*Waldenses*.

*viz.*  
\* *Frere Raimond Lollard fut alors le puissant instrument duquel dieu se voulut servir, pour par exhortations & visnes remonstrances donner cognoissance aux Anglois de la doctrine par laquelle les Vandois estoient liures a la mort. Ceste Doctrine fut receue par Wickliff, &c.* *Brother Raimond Lollard was the most powerfull instrument which God used by exhortations and sound Reason to give knowledge to the English of the Doctrine for which the Waldenses were put to death.*

*This Doctrine was received by Wickliff, as is noted in the confession of the Bohemian Churches, who thereby obtained much help for the encrease of his knowledg in the truth, by whose means the Do-*  
*ctrine*

*Strine of the Waldenses took footing and had free passage in England, and favored also in his time by many noble personages, viz. the Duke of Lancaster, the Lord Percy, the Earl of Salisbury, and Sir Lewis Clifford, whereby the Gospel had great progress, till the time of Gregory the 11. who pursued them with greivous persecutions, &c.*

Why denied Infants-Baptism as before.

And that Wickliff with the Waldenses denyd the Baptism of Infants, I gave you several grounds, especially out of his own writings, which I quoted from *Thomas Walden*, a learned man, who wrote against him in those times. The substance of which Arguments are these.

1st. *That faith is necessary to precede Baptism, without which Baptism is of no force, either to take away sin, or to save the soul; and, that none is rightly Baptized without it.*

2. *That Baptism profits not little ones either to the taking away of sin, or the saving of their souls. Confirmed by the testimony of Wicliffordus, Sir Lewis Clifford, Walden, and the decree of the Council of Constance against him for the same, and by the Doctrine and practise of his followers. p 283. &c.*

M.B's severe censure about Wickliff.

All which Mr. B. opposeth with great contempt; And from the 11. and 12. chapter of the 4th Book of his *Dialogia* (a great part of which he repeats) infers the quite contrary, viz. *That he positively asserted Infants-Baptism, holding it necessary to take away sin, and to save the Infant: And that he was so farr from holding believers to be the only subjects of Baptism, or that faith should precede it, that he maintained the quite contrary.*

contrary, viz. That Baptism should go before faith, charging me with many gross abuses and falsifications in my said quotations, and inferences; concluding thus p. 363, viz. And now, Reader judge what a sad case poor honest ignorant Christians are in, that must have their souls seduced, troubled, and led into love-killing alienations and separations, and censures of Christ's Church, and of their particular brethren, by such a man as this? And whether they that dare use souls at this rate, are so much better than us, as to be above our Communion? Nay, whether those that lately revile the zeal of dissenters, as cherishing the most odious crimes, be not too much scandalized and hardened by such dealings? when a man, as pleading for Christ and Baptism, dare not only print such things, but stand to them in a second Edition, and defend them by a second book, and rage and be confident in reviling those that tell him of his untruths.

At this rate doth Mr B. talk, as though his tongue was his own, and that he had a commission to say whatever he pleased. But whether Mr B. or I, have most deserved such reproof for abusing Wickliff and his doctrine, seducing and deluding others about them; will presently appear. And in order to which discovery, I shall do these 5 or 6. things.

First, give you some account of the nature and manner of Wickliff's writing in these Dialogues.

Secondly, of the matter treated of, especially in the 2 chapters we are concerned about.

Thirdly,

*Thirdly*, Shall give you the true state and account of each chapter.

*Fourthly*, discover Mr *Baxter's* injurious dealing with this author in several particulars.

*Fifthly*, confirm to you my former positions concerning him.

1 Wickliff's  
book a di-  
alogue of  
3. parts,  
and who  
speaks in it

*First*, As to the nature of Wickliff's writing in this book, it is *Dialogue-wise*; wherein there are 3 parties speaking, viz. *Aletheia* (or Truth) representing a solid divine, propounding the Questions to be discussed: 2d *Phronesis* (or wisdom) an acute subtil *Theologian*, answering: 3dly *Pseudis* (or a liar) a captious person objecting, though, in the 11 and 12. chapters (spoken of) *Pseudis* be silent; The book is therefore called by some learned men in their writings *Triialogia*, or a *Dialogue* of 3 parts, but the name of the book is *Diologia*, or Wickliff's *Dialogues*, whence arose my mistake in the Catalogue I gave of Wickliff's books supposing they had been 2 books.

2 Treats of  
the Sacra-  
ments.

*Secondly*, As to the matter treated on, you'll finde it to be about the *Sacraments*, detecting therein the *Popish errors* and *superstitions*; He begins with that of the *Lords-supper*; and having largely and learnedly refuted the blasphemy of their breaden-God, and their horrible mistake of, *Matth. 26. 26. This is my Body*; he comes in these 2 chapters to discover their great mistake in Baptism, from their erroneous sense they gave of *Jo. 3. 5. Except a man be born of water*, &c. concluding it baptismal water, and therefore to be imposed as essentially necessary

to

to *salvation*; and that without it no Infant can be saved or have his sins washed away; which he learnedly here refutes.

Thirdly, You have the right state and true account of the two Chapters: first, briefly, Secondly, more at large, *viz.* 3 The state of both Chapters.

First, briefly. The Eleventh Chapter consists of two parts: The first treats of the Doctrine of Baptism, as taught, 1. In the Primitive, 2. In the Romish, 3. In the Waldensian Churches. The Second propounds 3. questions, 1. about the vertue of signes in general. 2. the other two about Infants-baptism as to salvation and damnation: answering the first about signes.

The Twelfth Chapter answers the two questions about Infants-baptism.

Secondly, More at large, wherein the Reader for his better information is desired to take notice, that what in *Italick* is marked thus \* Mr B. hath before mentioned of the Chapters, and what is not so marked, he left out, which the Reader is desired carefully to observe.

### Chap. XI.

IN the 11th chapter *Alethia* desires *Phronesis* to speak something about Baptism. *Phron.* doth therefore, First acquaint \* *How Baptism is established in the Gospel*, both by Precept and practise: First delivering the precept in Christs Commission, *Matth. 28.* wherein he commands his Disciples first to teach, then to Baptize: Secondly, the practise: For which he gives 2. instances, *viz.* *Act. 8.* of Philips first teaching (ac-  
cording

1. The doctrine of Baptism in the Primitive Church.



‘cording to Christs Commission) then afterwards  
 ‘Baptizing the Eunuch; And Act. 12. where the A-  
 ‘postles first taught, then afterwards Baptized  
 ‘(those that gladly received the word) the latter  
 of which Mr. B. leaves out, viz. *sicut fecerunt A-*  
*postoli Act. 2. quando populum baptizârunt*: clear-  
 ly holding out that Repentance and Faith were  
 the great prerequisites to Baptism, and which  
 according to Christs Commission, and primitive  
 Churches practise was to be eyed before the  
 administration thereof; And that Baptism ought  
 to follow faith, and not go before it, faith be-  
 ing that upon which the stresse of salvation  
 lyes: *He that believes shall not be condemned.*  
 And having laid this Foundation in the Doctrin  
 and practise of Christs Church, gives you next  
 the Doctrin and practise of AntiChrists-Church,  
 viz.

2. The Do-  
 ctrine of  
 Baptism in  
 the Church  
 of Rome.

Secondly, tells you, that the Chnrch of Rome,  
 which (for discourse sake) he calls *Our Church*,  
 (as in the beginning of the Chapter he calls our  
*Pfendis* or our *Lyer*, and afterwards *Our Reli-*  
*gious nostri Religiosi*) from this form of Christs  
 ‘words, Math. 28. (viz. requiring a profession of  
 ‘faith to precede) do bring God-Fathers answer-  
 ‘ing for the Infant who had not attained to discre-  
 ‘tion, instructing them, after Baptism, in the Lords  
 ‘prayer, and the Creed.

‘And that this Sacrament is so necessary to every  
 ‘one, That Christ sayth to Nicodemus, John. 3.  
 ‘Except a man be born again of water, &c. So that  
 ‘by so great Authority of scripture-belief the faith-  
 ‘ful are generally Baptized. And the Church hath  
 ‘ordained

ordained (viz. by its Canons) that in poyne of necessity or danger of death, every one be Baptized, provided it be done as they enjoyn, viz: That they be Baptized in simple water, not in urine or other liquors, not exemplified by Christ: *Ad Baptizationem autem dicunt requiri aquam simplicem, non Urinam vel liquorem alium cum hoc non sit a Domino exemplatum,* which clause M. B. leaves out also. Nor is it material whether they be dipt once or thrice, or the water be poured on their heads; but it must be done according to the custome of the place where one dwelleth, as well in one as in the other Lawfull Rite.

Shewing hereby, how they deviate from the Order before-mentioned of Christ's appointment, in first Baptizing, and then teaching afterwards: 2dly, How they alter the end, which was not to save by the act done, which they enjoin so mistakenly, imposing it upon all from Job. 8. 5. 3ly, their altering the manner either to thrice dipping or pouring water (or sprinkling if it be the custome of the place) appoynting it not to be done in Urine or other liquors, as though Christ had left that at uncertainty also.

Thirdly, he gives the substance of their own belief herein, in oposition to the Romish, and agreeable to the primitive pattern.

Declaring it as a principle of their Faith, that it is certain that corporal baptism or washing little availeth, unless there be a washing of the minde by the holy Ghost from original or actual sin; And that whoever is rightly Baptized, viz. with this Baptism of the spirit, baptism bloteth out whatever sin

3. The Doctrine of Baptism among the Wickliffs

it

it findeth in the man to be baptized [with water]:  
 And, because satisfaction is necessary to the blot-  
 ting out of sin, and satisfaction for sin cannot be  
 made but by the death of Christ, therefore sayth the  
 Apostle, As many of us as are Baptized into Christ,  
 are baptized into his death:

So that, according to Christ's Rule, he holds  
 out the necessity of the washing of Regeneration  
 or faith in the blood of Christ, which he calls the  
 spirits Baptism, to precede that of water, as that  
 upon which he layes the stress both for remission  
 of sins and salvation, in opposition to the Romish  
 faith and doctrine, which placeth it in the bare  
 work done, by the outward washing.

To all which *Alethia* consents, and then pro-  
 pounds, the 3 following questions, viz.

3. *Questi-*  
*on,*  
 1. About  
 signes or  
 Sacra-  
 ments.

First, Tell me plainlier, how Christ, who so  
 much hateth sensible signes, hath put so great neces-  
 sity of salvation in this washing. Not believing  
 though, that either Christ hateth sensible signes  
 or that he hath put the necessity of salvation in  
 Baptism; But doth it only, to draw forth the  
 true understanding of this Sacrament, & to hold  
 forth the absurdity of the Church of Rome,  
 whose sense she speaks therein, as laying the  
 stresse of salvation upon the external Rite.

2. Whether  
 an unbap-  
 tized In-  
 fidel can  
 be saved.

Secondly, Doth it not seem to derogate from  
 Gods liberality and power, that God cannot by all his  
 merit and passion intercede to save an Infant, or  
 an Adult believer, unless he be baptized by an Old  
 woman or an Infidel? The Church of Rome, con-  
 cluding none saved without the act of Baptism, &  
 have therefore by several Canons, ordained the



liberality of Christ God if such a child of believers  
shall be drawn forth for that which is not in their power  
when God; according to the common principles of  
Theologia is prone to regard men than to damn  
them; and specially when the merit and passion of  
Christ; hath so far stretcht out their merits.

1. Quest.  
about  
signes an-  
swered.

To all which Rhodensis prophesie; preuising by  
way of caution; thus in some things he speaks repu-  
tatively (viz. conditionally, coniecturally, or  
in the sense of the Ancients) whereof there is no  
certainty from the scriptures; and in some  
things assertatively, viz. when he speaks of the  
Evidente and Authority of the scripture.

2. Quest.  
about us  
and how  
many  
signes

And then, to the first about signes, he sayth,  
that Christ hath not hate signes; but approved of  
them both in the Old and new Testament; in the  
old, by the Brazen Serpent; and by Jonah's being  
in the Whales Belly; and also in the New, by  
himself being a strifful sign; and that of the Sa-  
craments too, inasmuch as the description of a Sa-  
crament agreeeth hereto along; and that Baptisme  
was a new-Testament sign; and Sacrament of life and  
perpetuall life; and that from out of nothing is  
But that is not the abuse of signes, that he  
bated and which were abused in many.

Signes a-  
bused 3.  
ways.

First, By  
keeping Old Jewish abrogated Lawes; and by  
burthening men with them, more in them than  
God, has appointed and preferring them before  
the moral law it self; and by, By burthening the  
Church with them, which Christ would have  
free, even more then the Jewish Church was  
burthened. And thus the Religion now (viz. the  
Church of Rome) abuse them (especially) the 2  
last



*last ways*: concluding that we may use, but must not abuse, signs; That Baptism was a sign or Sacrament of Christs Institution, and which with due caution and consideration, as a help in our way to heaven, we ought to use.

This must be minded, that the designe of this discourse in this Sacrament of Baptism, as well as in the other, is to assert the right use according to Christs institution, and to discover and reprove the Antichristian abuse thereof.

## CHAP. XII.

**A** *Letter* having declared her approbation concerning what had been spoken about signs, though the Church of Rome, so much reflected upon thereby, desires him to speak to the other two objections. *Phronesis* therefore to that, Whether Christ cannot save a child that dyes without the Baptism of an Old woman, or Infidel, Replies:

*It seems to me probable, that Christ can sufficiently Baptize Infants spiritually, without this washing; and, by consequence, can save them, viz. without the help of the old woman or Infidel.* answering it in the affirmative, though the Church had judged otherwise; concluding, that all such that dye without such a Baptism of water, were damned, and for which *Wickliff* gives several reasons.

First, because in assigning the Baptism of the Spirit, which he alleged to be the cause of sal-

*2. Q. And answered, viz. that an unbaptized Child may be saved.*

*1. Because, it may be baptized with the Spirit.*

vation, it was no new thing, their Church approving of the distinction: therefore, saith he,

*Whence it is commonly sayd [viz. by the Fathers in their books] that there is a 3fold Baptism of the Church, viz. the Baptism of water, the Baptism of blood, and the Baptism of the spirit. And every of them to the meet (or right subject, as Wickliffe concludes) sufficeth to Salvation, viz.*

Lum 4. sent. comp. Theol. v. 1. 6. c. 9.

If a believer be baptized in water, he shall be saved. And if a believer be baptized in blood, he shall be saved: And he that is baptized in the spirit though baptized neither in water nor blood, shall certainly be saved; that being the Baptism, that is simply necessary to salvation.

2. Children might be saved without Circumcision.

Secondly, because children that dyed without circumcision (which the Fathers held to be so absolutely necessary to salvation, and to take away Original sin) yet, he concluded, might be saved, and therefore, sayth thus, *Nor dare I assert that the Infants slayn for Christ [Mat. 2. who were not circumcised within the 8th day] which Mr B. leaves out, are damned.*

Why the spirit-Baptism saves.

Thirdly, because the Baptism of the spirit hath so much vertue and force in it, beyond either of the other; 1. that of the spirit being absolutely necessary to salvation, without which no salvation; that of water and blood, but supposed necessary to it: 2. that of the spirit being the inward thing signified, the other but the outward signes thereof. 3. that of the spirit takes away sin, which the other have no force to do, so that if that be wanting, the other signify nothing: therefore, presumptuous folly to

But

judge damnation or salvation by external Baptism: His own words being expressly thus, viz. *But the Baptism of the Spirit is the Baptism of the holy Ghost which is simply necessary to every one that he be saved. Therefore the other two Baptisms are antecedent signs* [ viz. to our sense ] *and suppositively necessary to this third Baptism of the Spirit; Therefore, without doubt, where that insensible Baptism is, the baptized person is cleansed from his sin: and if that be wanting, let the former be never so much presented, Baptism profits not the soul to salvation: seeing therefore, this is insensible, and so much unknown to us, it seemeth to me imprudent presumption so to define mens salvation or damnation by their Baptism.*

But then, if it be as you have concluded, against the Church, That a child may be saved without Baptism, what do you say if it has Baptism administered to it, either by the priests-hand in the Church, or by the old woman or Infidel in case of necessity; shall not that child dying upon it certainly be saved as the Church hath also determined?

Whether all baptized Children be saved.

To which he sayth much as before, That if God please to give Baptismal grace, such a child, rightly Baptized in water ( viz. by a priest ) or by an old woman or infidel, has the 3d Baptism, and consequently, shall be saved, and so of persons baptized in blood; but the baptizing of such a child doth not effect salvation. His words are these ( so concluding against the Church, here also ) *But we repine, without*

*Answered.* such only as God gives Baptismal grace unto.

‘doubting, that Infants rightly baptized with water (viz. in the best way the Church can procure) are baptized with the third Baptism, when they have baptismal grace, viz. when God shall please to give it them, not as Mr B. falsely renders it, seeing they have, and, having baptismal grace, viz. upon their baptism; No, that would be to overthrow all that he had sayd.

And so I repute (sayth Wickliffe) of martyrs slain for Christ though not baptized with water; which Mr B. mentions not, viz. persons baptized in blood, may, if God please, be baptized with the spirit, and be sav'd. And so in like manner of children baptized by an old woman or Infidel in necessity; he sayth afterwards.

‘We believe that what Old woman soever, or other person, rightly washeth one with sacramental words (The Canon being they must pronounce the formal words of Baptism, viz. ‘I baptize thee in the name of the Father son and holy spirit.’) God fulfilleth the Baptism of the spirit, that is, If he please, he can save such a child giving it the holy spirit, though it follows not, that it must therefore have it from God, because the old woman has washed it, though Mr B. injuriously so inferrs; and which the next words (which he leaves out) doth demonstrate, viz. *Modicum enim valent signa nostra, nisi de quanto illi Deus acceptaverit gratiose*, That our signes avail little (or are of little force or efficacion, unless so far forth as God shall graciously work or give his approbation of them.

And though as to the third Question, whether Infants-

Infants, dying in the Church, before they are baptized, though brought thither with that intent, be all damned? He answers much as before, that God can, if he please, save such a one; or he may damn him if he please; and that he dare not through ignorance define positively either way (though the Church has positively determin'd in the affirmative); but concludes, it is by their own authority without knowledge, and presumtuously foolish in any so to do, for which take his own words.

*And by this I answer your third objection, granting, That God if he will, may damn such an Infant And do him no wrong, and if he will he can save him; neither dare I define either part, nor am I careful about reputation, or giving evidence in the case; but as a dumb man am silent, humbly confessing my ignorance, using conditional words, (viz. if he will) because it is not yet clear to me, whether such an Infant shall be saved or damned: But I know, that whatever God doth in it, will be just, and a work of mercy; to be pray'd of all the faithful. And let not them, like presumptuous fooles, pour out themselves, that of their own Authority, without knowledge, define any thing in that matter; but he that sayeth in this case put, an Infant shall be saved, as it is pious to believe, he doth superfluously uncertain himself, (viz. determine an uncertainty) more then will profit him, &c.*

So that it is manifest, he concludes against the Church of Rome, in all three Questions: First, in abusing the Sacrament, putting more in it then



God has appoynted; secondly, in both the other, viz. That a child that dyes without Baptism may be saved, whether he miss it by the hand of an old woman or a Priest: And he may be saved, if God please to give him Baptismal grace, if he be baptized either by a Priest or an Old woman and so it may be with those that are baptized in Martyrdom, which is only by way of supposition, without any certain conclusion; and that they are foolish and presumptuous, that positively determine such secrets of God either as to damnation or salvation. And for which he is censured by *Widifordus*, the Conncil of *Constance*, and *Walden*, for putting the presumptuous fool upon the Church, both in their Fathers and Councils, who so positively determined, that the baptized child had his sins forgotten, and soul saved, and that the child that dyed without it, was certainly damned, and must not therefore have Christian burial.

But what doth he say to the main Objection, from *Jo. 3. 5*. *Except a man be born again of water and the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven?* Is not water, there, to be understood material water? and so, consequently, baptismal water, and therefore none to be saved without it, as the Church has determined?

*John. 3. 5.*  
*Answered.*

To this he fully answers, that if you will understand it of material water, it was only the water out of Christs-side; but that, he takes sit, to hold out the effect of Christs death, which came out with the blood, and be regenerated by, which we must believe with the help also of the spirit

Spirit of Christ, which must manage that work in the soul, though it mystically holds out Baptism also.

His words are these: *And further, as to the faith of that Scripture Jo. 3. 5. Except a man be born of water &c. That probably Christ might speak of the water which flowed out of his side, and third-Baptism, because it appears that a man martyred for Christ, although not Baptized in water may be saved. Therefore it seems probable to understand Christ in the negative sense, that no man can enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, except he is Baptized with water flowing out of his side, and with the third-Baptism: seeing that, the Trinity cannot save those that are fallen, by bringing them to blessedness, except the 2d. and 3d. person purge them.*

And agreeable hereto is his saying in his Ep. *serm. 6. secundum Walden, viz. If it be objected that proper Baptism is not absolutely required (viz. to save and take away sin) I confess, that the Baptism of the spirit by the merit of the flowing of the materiall water out of his side doth suffice, for as many of us as are Baptized into Christ are Baptized into his death. And so by water and spirit he means no other than the washing of regeneration and renewing of the holy Ghost, viz. The application of Christs death by the spirit, without which none can be saved, nor indeed profitably, as he observes, Baptized in water.*

Whereupon Walden saith, *Fontem aque regenerationis in vitam aeternam que Christus in Evangelio sufficienter & efficienter effodere dignatus est,*

*Nisi*

*Walden  
exceptis a-  
gainst ex-  
position of  
Jo. 3. 5.*

*Nisi quis Renatus, &c. Sophistice obstruunt Wickliffe, sicut puteos Abraham in Palistina. 2 Rom. c. p. 104. The fountain of the water of Regeneration in Eternallife, which Christ in the Gospel hath sufficiently and effectually dug, viz. Jo. 3. 5. the Wickliffits have sophisticelly stoppt, as were Abrahams wells in Judea.*

But, was Wickliff against water Baptism? or did not he lay so much stress upon the Spirits-Baptism, as at least to disesteem or undervalue that of water?

*Wickliff  
for water-  
Baptism-*

No: he prized it and layd a due stress upon it, as an Ordinance of Christ that ought carefully and Conscientiously to be attended; see to that end, his own words immediatly following.

*And so Christ briefly and spiritually by a miracle taught to observe the first Baptism (or water-Baptism) in those Evangelical words (viz. Jo. 3. 5.)*

*And that it was not lawfull for believers, on supposition of the Baptism of the spirit, to cast off the Baptism of water; but it is necessary to receive it when the opportunity of Circumstance is offered; And seeing whatever cometh to pass, of necessity it may be said, that such a one cannot be saved without such Baptism, but this we know repugnantly, &c. viz. As may be supposed in case of wilful contempt or refusing to own and confess Christs Ordinances through fear or Worldly respects.*

And that he was fully for that Ordinance appears by his former Reasonings in answer to the first Question pleading for the necessary use of it, and against its abuse; and that, being kept in

its

its right place, it was very profitable for us; his words are these.

And so it is manifest we may use signs, and especially those instituted by Christ; yet with a proviso; by making heed to its abuses: Inasmuch therefore, as Christ himself hath instituted the sign of Baptism; why ought we not considerably and carefully to observe that sign, especially when we are yet in our way or journey, without a perfect knowledge? In which way, it is necessary to be instructed by such kind of signs. And to this end, in the beginning of his discourse doth he lay down Christs Commission to Baptise taught-believers; and the primitive Saints practise in obedience to it.

Fourthly, we shall give you some Account of M. B's injurious dealing with this our witness, making him speak quite contrary to his declared sense, and fathering Popish principles upon him, which he disavows and Reasons against viz.

First, he tells us, that Wickliffe was so far from denying Infants-Baptism that he expressly asserth it (viz. as his own judgment and practise of their Church.)

A notorious abuse: As though Wickliffe's telling us what their Church held (viz. the Church of Rome as before) about Baptizing Children by God-fathers, and teaching them their Creed, and Pater-Noster afterwards; And the Baptizing them in case of danger of death by an Old woman or Infidel, for their salvation from Jo. 3. 5; was therefore Wickliffe's judgment and the Waldensian faith and practise, which was known to be

4ly. Discover several particulars, wherein M. B. hath injured Wickliffe.

1. That he expressly asserth Infants-Baptism. Refuted.

and

the quite contrary in both. For as to their denying *Gossips* or *Baptizing* upon the faith of others, how manifestly is that made good, not only from their old *confessions* which disown the bringing of any to the Sacraments without their own personall faith, renouncing that of *Gossips*; *Rainarius* tells us & *Cluniacensis* reports of them as before. And as *Walden* replies to *Wickliff* in these words, *Tom.2.ch.99.Fol.102. Qui crediderit & Baptizatus fuerit, saluus erit, qui uero non crediderit, condemnabitur: Quid dicis ad hoc? Iste parvulus tuus, nec per se, per alios baptismaliter credit: quomodo non condemnabitur? He that believes and is baptized shall be saved but he that believes not shall be condemned: what sayst thou to this? This thy child neither by himself nor by others, Baptismally believes; how then shall he escape damnation?*

And that the *Waldenses* and *Wickliff* himself did deny them to be baptized to take away sin and save them, is fully granted us by Mr B. again and again: so that this must needs be a slanderous imputation.

3. That it  
is according  
to Christs  
Rule to  
Baptize  
Infants.  
Answered.

But doth not *Wickliff* say, that, *It is according to Christs Rule, that Infants are brought to the Church to be baptized? and what can be more positive?*

It is true, Mr B. sayth he doth; but, how truly. Let all men judge. The words are in *Alethia's* Question, not *Phronesis* or *Wickliff's* solution, who took the liberty to propound what she would in a popish sense, the better to discover their corruption in the answer: And Mr B. might as well have said that, because *Alethia*



in the foregoing Question, sayth, that *Christ* has sensible signes, and that he placed the necessity of salvation in Baptism, that therefore the one and the other was *Wickliffs* judgment and the *Waldensian* faith. The Question was only, whether a child, intended to be baptized in the best way most as the Church of *Rome* judged according to *Christs Rule*, viz. in the Church by a Priest, &c. and dyed, before it could be effected, was damned, as *Austin* and the Councils had determined: Therefore, that, such baptizing of Infants was according to *Christs Rule*, as little appears to be *Wickliffs* judgment, as that over any thing such thing was made appear to be *Christs Rule* by any word of Christ or practise of the primitive saints, either by *Papist* or *Protestant*. We know what the *Papists* and most *Protestants* (as Mr *B.* has informed us) take to be a Rule from Christ in the case. viz. Tradition, and the Churches direction, But that was no Rule to the *Waldenses*, nor to *Wickliff* or his followers, who so much impugned humane Traditions and all their popish Canons and decrees; esteeming nothing to be a Rule of Christ in his worship but some expresse words of Christ to warrant it.

But doth not *Wickliff* tell us in expresse words, That when Infants are rightly Baptized with water, that they hold, They are baptized with the third Baptism, having Baptismal grace?

It is true; Mr *B.* with great confidence again and again tells us so: but how injuriously, let all men judge.

For

3. That Children Baptized in water are Baptized with the Spirit: Reply'd to.

For firstly, Wickliffe sayth no such words: they are not; *cum habent* or *habentes*, seeing they have; or *having*, as Mr B. renders them in two places, but *cum habent*, when they have.

Secondly, Wickliffe intends no such thing, but the quite contrary to what he would make him say by such a miserable inverting of his sense: he doth not say or plead, that Children baptiz'd in water have therefore *Baptismal* grace, and the third Baptism, and consequently salvation thereby, (as Mr B. would make him affirm). For, that was the very thing the Papists affirmed, and he opposed, contradicting the sense of Jo: 3: 8, whereon they founded such a principle, and in express terms telling us that the one may be without the other, and that there is no judging, we have the one by the other; and that it is presumption and folly, and to speak like a Pye for any so to affirm. All that he sayth, or intends, on those words, was only this, That God can save, if he please, a child baptiz'd in the right way: they could pervert, and that such a child had the 3d Baptism, and should be saved when God gave him *Baptismal* grace; and so take of the child baptiz'd by an Old woman in English.

And, as a further confirmation that Wickliffe intended nothing else, than what Mr B. would make him say, herein take The Wickliffe's sense of them, who had more cause to know his meaning in them than Mr B. and would doubtless have improved such an advantage, if it had been truly good in him, as he is thought quite otherwise, as you finde it. *Taylors*

and T. 3. These children baptiz'd in water, and B. renders them with the signification of the signification.

For

fol.

fol. 105. *Nolles nos formare Reputationem quam novellam circa certissima verba Christi, sicut ibi subiungis; Reputamus tamen, absque dubietate, &c. procul hinc cum reputationibus tuis hereticis.* Walden opposeth Wickliff for this sentence. *&c. Thou wouldst have us form thy new reputation upon the certain words of Christ, as thou here subjoynes: We repute without doubting that Children rightly Baptized with water, are Baptized with the third Baptism, &c. Away with your heretical reputation: we do again, without malignance, repeat word the repeated words simply and undoubtedly define, He that believeth and is Baptized, shall be saved, &c. None is excepted from this sentence, great or small; for, whoever doth not Baptismally believe either by himself, if he be an adult, or by another, if an Infant, shall be damned.*

But Wickliff (saith Mr. B.) doth say in express words, *That Baptism doth put away all sin in the rightly baptized.* 4 Baptism puts away sin.

Mr. B. doth indeed tell us so; but it is another fearfull mistake, wholly inverting both his words and sense again. Wickliff's words are these: *Refuted.*

*First, this is a principle in this belief, that whosoever is rightly Baptized, Baptism bloteth out whatever sin it findeth in the man to be Baptized (viz. whosoever is rightly Baptized with the Spirit which washeth away Original and a Guilt sin, that Baptism (viz. the Spirit Baptism) bloteth out whatever sin it findeth in the man that is to be Baptized in water: But Mr. B. would make him say (in confirmation of his former mistake) whosoever is rightly Baptized in water, that Baptism put away*

away all sin; which is the Popish false corrupt Doctrine he reasons against, and refutes.

5. Wickliff was for an old woman Baptizing a child. But Wickliff (saith Mr. B. was for an old woman's Baptizing of a child, in necessity (viz. in peril of death to save it, the end wherefore it was enjoynd) and which he concludes to be good Baptism.

A great falsehood.

Notoriously false again: All that he saith or intendeth in the Case, is this, that God can, if he will, save such a child which an old woman or Infidell Baptizeth, as he can save the Child that dyes before they baptize it. But, must it therefore be his judgment, that they are good administrators of Baptism to Children? is not this strange Reasonings?

Doth not Mr. B. himself tell us again and again, at another time, that Wickliff was against Baptizing Children to save them, as he grants the Beringarians and Waldenses were and must be now again and again be made to be of another minde? For, wherefore was this kind of old women and Infidells Baptism introduced, but to save the dying Child, as the Canons enjoynd? and which was so doubtful amongst themselves, that they Baptized it again, if the Child lived? Must our Eminent worthy that so loathed such abominations, and so set himself against the principle it self, that introduced such horrid innovations, be thus made to assert them? if this be not daring temerity, I know not what is.

6. That Wickliff affirm'd saith Mr. B. that water Baptism was to precede believing.

Mr. B. further tells us, in opposition to what I affirmed Wickliff held, viz. that persons ought to be Baptized with the insensible Baptism & viz. have

have faith and Repentance or Regeneration) before they are Baptized in water : that Wickliff held the quite contrary, viz. that the two former Baptisms of Water and Blood, are but Antecedent signs to the third Baptism of the spirit : therefore saith he, see how this man is to be believed; Wickliff calling Water-Baptism an Antecedent sign contrary to most Protestant writers that hold children are in a state of Salvation before they are Baptized.

But whether this dealing is not like the rest, judge ye : For by this Argument, that he would make Wickliff to say; Water-Baptism was to precede the spirit-Baptism, he makes him say; that blood-Baptism must precede it too, for that is one of the Baptismi priores, & signa antecedentia; by which we must understand; that Wickliff thought, that none could be saved, or have their sins pardoned, but those that not only are Baptized in water, but those that are Baptized in blood also? for by the same Rule, that one is to precede Regeneration, the other is so also; Therefore that cannot be Wickliff's meaning in the words; which Mr. B. would so unfairly fasten upon him.

But all that Wickliff seems to speak in them, is this; That the insensible Baptism is the only necessary Baptism, upon which remission of sins and salvation depends; and that the other two, blood and water, are only the sensible outward, visible signs of that inward, insensible & invisible grace, viz. goes before as to sense, shew, and appearance; but ought to follow in reality and truth : and so he



doth expresse himself, that by the spirit-Baptism, *sin is to be blotted out in him that is to be baptized in water, viz.* that he that is to be Baptized in Water, ought to have some assurance of the remission of his *sins* by the blood of Christ, in the first place. And therefore Fuller so well collects that passage out of Waldens 98 chapter, as one of Wickliff's positions, *viz.* That Baptism doth not confer, but only signifies grace given before. Fuller Eccl. Hist. 14. Cent. 4. B. p. 133. And which is indeed the Nature of all Wickliff's reasonings, and the Scripture-Authorities and instances given, *viz.* That Sacraments are not to precede or to work or give grace, but to confirm, establish and signe it out: And, that without grace before wrought, Sacraments avail not.

We might go through the rest of the Popish Tenets he fathers upon him; but they being not to the point of Baptism, we will leave the Reader to judge of them, by these we have examined, to that head. And is it not a thing to be lamented, that so great a man as Wickliff was, whose fellow was not to be found from the Apostles days to his time, should have so much dirt and filth cast upon him, and rendred so Popish and Anti-Christian, whenas he was raised so eminently by God to be so great a scourge & maul to that Interest?

It is true: I find in Mr. Iame's his Apologie for Jo. Wickliff, that in some of his first writings he spoke not so soundly concerning Purgatorie, and some other Popish Doctrines; as also concerning absolute necessity, which Mr. B. charges upon him.

him. But Mr. James observes, that his after-writings speak otherwise, and that the Elder he grew, the more he loathed and detested their abominable heresies. He tells us concerning Purgatory: in his book *De ver. Script.* p. 267. he hath this expression, *Omnia dicta de Purgatorio, dicuntur solummodo comminatione tanquam pia mendacia*; that all the sayings of Purgatory were spoken by way of Commination; as it were so many Religious lies: And concerning Decrees and absolute necessity, He telleth us in the same book, p. 383. *Deus nemini promittit pœnam vel premium, nisi sub conditione, tacitâ vel expressâ, &c.* that God's promises and threatnings are conditional: And that as God hath appoynted the end, so he hath appointed the means of our salvation, In *Expos. Decal.* p. 81.

And notwithstanding his charging of Wickliff here, yet how doth he vindicate Wickliff herein, in his plea with the Jesuite: *H.T.* in his *Key for Cath.* p. 132. Name not the Wickliffians (saith the Jesuite) for they held that all things came to pass by fatall necessity; To which Mr. B. saith, We know by many of Wickliffs own books printed, and Manuscripts, what his judgment was, whatever your Council of Constance accuse him of. It was a Divine Necessity opposed to uncertainty, and to the determination of an unrul'd will, that he mentioneth, and yet hath he now the confidence to bring the Jesuites charge against him, having so fully acquitted him heretofore; therefore he must not forget, who had need of a good Memory.

If Mr. B. were as free from Popish Doctrines, as *Id. Wickliff* was, there would not need that cry of the learned against him for the same, as there is at this day, and of which we may tell you more hereafter.

My assertions of *Wickliff* confirmed.

In the last place, my assertions concerning him in point of witness for believers, and against Infants-Baptism, do, I doubt not, fully appear.

1st, For believers Baptism only.

For, is it not manifest, that he asserts it to be according to Christ's Commission, and the primitive Churches practice, that Repentance and Faith should precede it? and asserts it a Principle of their belief; that *water-Baptism* avails not, profits not, without it, either as to remission of sins, or to salvation, or to grace?

And as to that of witnessing against Infants-Baptism, what more full? as appears;

First, by his striking at the root of it; opposing the sense of that main Scripture they found it upon, viz. *Ioh. 3. 5.*

2. Against Infants Baptism & so.

Secondly, by his opposing of Gossips, or their being Baptized by the faith of another; which were the two main Pillars the Papists built it upon; and therefore did they go out against *Wickliff* for denying it; upon this very account, as witness, First, *Wickliff* who wrote against him and censured him for opposing the Tradition of the Church, the opinion of the Fathers, the decrees of Councils, yea, the Scripture also (as he supposeth) therein, as appears in his book *De confirmat. Sacra. p. 123. 124. as Fascicul. Rerum expetend. p. 102. 103.*

*Wickliff* opposed for denying Infants Baptism.

Evidenceth.

And

And 2dly by the Council of Constance, who censured him for this very thing, as appears in the said Council of Book, Fascicul. Rerum. p. 134.

And afterwards, by Thomas Walden, who Walden writes 12. large Chapters to impugn these his Dogma's about Baptism; in these two Chapters, severely censuring him for denying Infants-Baptism, and to be worse then the Manichees, Messalians, Vincen ius, Victor, and other Hereticks, that did the like.

And therefore it is, that Joseph Vicecomes, doth Vicecomes. put John Wickliff in the Catalogue of those that deny'd Infants-Baptism, as appears (sayth he) by his writing his Trialogia, 4. Book and 12. Chapter. Vicecom. Lib. 2. cap. 1. p. 102, 10.

And as he opposed the Popish Infants-Bap Wickliff tism (and the main grounds upon which they opposed had established it); so did he oppose the grounds the Protestants have since practised the Protestant as well as Popish Infants-Baptism. it also, viz. upon federal holiness, as may appear by what is sayd to this purpose, both concerning himself and followers, viz.

Walsingham in his Ypodigma Neustria, tells us, Walsin. Upon the year 1381. That in this time it was that gam. that most-damnable Heretick John Wickliff re-assumed the cursed opinions of Beringarius, (which as you have heard, was the denying the real presence, and Baptism to little ones for salvation). And anno 1402. tells us, His followers did deny Infants-Baptism because they concluded them, as they were the Children of believers, to be holy, and so needed not to be baptized to wash away Original guilt. And which, he sayth, Sir Lewis Clifford (heretofore

(heretofore as you have heard Wickliff's great friend and follower, and now turn'd from them) discovered to the Archbishop of Canterbury: Walsingham's words are these. *Item si haberent puerum modò-natum, non baptizaretur, quia puer iste non contaminata peccato, &c. Quas conclusiones Lewis Clifford, Miles, qui jam-judum Lollardi fautor extiterat, diu sub terminorum involucris palliatis, sed jam denudatas Archiepiscopo Cantuariensi patefecit; &c.*

Tho. Wal-  
den.

And agreeable hereto, Thomas Walden, Tom. 3. De Baptismi Sacramentalibus, c. 53. p. 118, tells us, that the Lollards who were Wickliff's followers in Scotland, and several in the Bishop of Norwich his Diocese, did hold, that the Children of the faithful were not sacramentally to be baptized: and the Reason they give, was this, Because grace was powred into their souls by the Spirit, by which little ones were sufficiently Baptized, and which they grounded upon the 1 Cor. 7. 14. Else, were your Children unclean, but now are they holy: his words are these, viz. *Fetus à fidelibus propagatus non sit Sacramentaliter Baptizandus, quod quàm citò anima est corpori unita, infunditur gratia Spiritûs sancti, perquam sufficienter parvulus baptizatur. 1 Cor. 7.*

And further tells us, that the Wickliffites say, that they judged it unprofitable to give Children Ecclesiastical Baptism; but that they sayd, They were sufficiently holy and clean, because they were born of Christian Parents, affirming it to be the same mad Heresy, which the Albigenian Hereticks or Publicani of old, did affirm. His words are



are these, viz. *Noſtri Wickleviſtæ*, *Baptiſmum Eccleſiaſticum inutile judicant*, ſed ſufficienter eos dicunt eſſe mundatos & ſanctos, quia de ſanctis parentibus & Chriſtianis naſcuntur, cum *Hæretici olim Albigenſes dicti Publicani hunc invenère uſaniam*, &c.

And agreeable hereto, John Fox in his *Martyrology*, Vol. 1. p. 867, &c. tells us, that *Abraham of Colcheſter*, and the reſt of the Chriſtians call'd *Lollards* or *Wickliffiſt's* taken, anno. 1428. were charged to hold, That Children of the baptized believers needed not to be baptized, and that if they dyed without Baptiſm, they might be ſaved. And that one of the Articles they put to diſcover a *Lollard* by, was, whether an Infant dying without Baptiſm, might be ſaved. See more hereof *Treat. p. 304.*

All which layd together may be a ſufficient comment upon the Text, and very well explain *John Wickliſſ's* meaning in theſe Chapters of his, before-mentioned; and which is left to the conſideration of the judicious Reader.

Thus, I doubt not but we have amply diſcharged our witneſſes from Mr *B's* *Clamours*, and ſhall not therefore queſtion to receive the Reader's acquittance from the many forgeries and deceits Mr *B.* hath injuriouſly charged upon me for the ſame; not only reſpecting *Tertullian*, but the *Donatiſts*, *Ancient-Britains*, the particular witneſſes mentioned from our *Dutch Authors*, the *Waldenſes*, and *Wickliff's*.

And therefore do ſubmit it to Mr *B's* conſideration, and the conſiderate Reader; whether it

might not have been more for Mr B's reputation to have given me upon my modest desire by my Book-seller ( when I reprinted my Book ) some account of his Exceptions, in a more private way, especially since I thereby also promised him, that if they appeared material, I would either answer them, or own my mistakes, and give him the honour of the information ; rather than thus to trouble the world and bring his own credit to this publick exposure for the same. His words to me in a vaunting manner after he had vented so much rage and malice against me, are these, p. 339. *And remember ( which you have told the world now in print ) that you sent your book-seller to me to know what I had to say against your first Edition before you published the second ; And I have here partly told you what.* The passage he hints at, that I put in print, you'll finde p. 364. *Treat. I can truly say, that I am not conscious of any one wilful mistake in the whole ; And that I have been very solicitous amongst all my friends and acquaintance to procure me what Objections they could gain from any ; but as yet have never since the Book came forth met with any thing like an Objection which I had not before obviated. No, not from Mr B. himself, though I have made particular Application to him for the same. And I think I may now as truly say, [no, not from Mr B. himself,] since he hath thus done his utmost, to bring forth his strongest objections ; the folly, falshood, and contradiction thereof ; so fully confirming, and not at all weakning, what he seems to oppose ; And that besides that full Evidence, he hath*

hath given us, to confirm a witness born against *Infants-Baptism*, those first ages (as already) before-remarkt to you, p. 17. and p. 18. ) He hath also (which mult not be forgotten ) again and again, expressly acknowledged, that the *Beringarians*, *Waldenses*, and *Wickliffians* did in opposition to the Church of Rome deny Children to be baptized for salvation ; And that the *Manichees* did positively deny *Infants-Baptism* whom I have ( upon so good ground ) proved to be no other people then the *Waldenses* themselves, and what can we have more, ( till he makes it appear that they did in those dayes baptize Children ; upon any other Ground ) and so in confirming the 14th. Chapter as he ratify'd the other 13. he has now subscribed to the whole Book.

*The End of the First Part.*

---

*The*

## The Second Part.

## CHAP. I.

Mr. Baxter's notorious Slanders further made good against him in accusing the Anabaptists for baptizing persons naked.

Sect. 1.

**I**T is true; I did in my Treatise p. 134. (as Mr Baxter sayth) complain of his Injurious charging the Anabaptists for baptizing men and women naked. (in p. 136. of Plain Scripture) without the least colour of proof for the same; and for which I called for due satisfaction.

What  
M.B. saith  
for his  
vindica-  
tion.

To which, he gives the following Reply in his own vindication, in p. 281. chapter 5. which he calls Mr D's great calumny refuted: Wherein he doth these things: First, owns The sin of be-lying others to be Diabolical, unprofitable; and a dreadful kind of folly: 2ly, he professes a hearty willingness to be Impartially examined concerning these things, with a disposition to give satisfaction for the same, if it may appear that he is guilty therein: 3ly, that he takes it to be unlawful to defame any upon doubtful Reports, and will heartily joyne with any in reforming backbiting and rash ungrounded defamation of others. 4ly, doth with much seriousness, as his last words, bespeak the Reader's belief, that he would not do so unlawful a thing as to belie himself in what he hath to say about it. 5ly, then proceeds, viz. That about ann. 47. or 48. when Anabaptistry began suddenly to be obtruded

M.B. now  
argeth for  
his proof  
common  
fame.

obtruded with more successful frequency, he being a Neighbour to some of them, and hearing of their practise in other parts of the Land did by common fame understand that some of them baptized naked, some not, and which neither Anabaptist, nor any other, that he can Remember did contradict, till his printing his Book an. 1650. falsely printed: 59. (viz. for two years space) he did then write against both sorts: viz. those that baptized naked, and those that did not; which neither Mr Tombs, nor any body else, from that time to this, have ever denyed, till this Man: appealing therefore to Impartial Reason, whether he that writes 25. or 26. years after, be fitter to be believed in a matter of fact, than Common consent at the present time. And, whether it be lawfull for him to take all sorts then living for Lyars, rather than this one man, that hath writen us such a Book, 25. years after, and who, in a Negative cannot be a competent witness: But if he say, that I writt that of all the Anabaptists, or of most, he would but deceive Men, it being nothing so; It is true, he confesseth, he did not see them Baptize Naked, neither can he prove that there are fornicators, Adulterers, Thieves, and Murderers, in the Nation; yet he presumes, he must be justified in preaching against, and calling to Repentance, the one as well as the other, without Slaunder: (Im- plying, he had as good ground by common Report and fame for the one, as the other, though he saw neither) and that, though now they may be ashamed of the thing, not continuing to do the same: So was the Donatists as to their self-Mur-  
thers.



thers ; the Anabaptists as to their Munster-pranks ; and Ranters in open Swearing, and whordom, &c. ( Insinuating they did most certainly begin so to do as well as others ).

So that the substance of what he saith in the proof of the matter of fact, that Anabaptists did Baptize Naked, as, *common fame and consent*, and that the truth thereof was neither *contradicted* before he wrote the *Book*, nor ever since, Either by themselves, or any other, till my Book five or six and twenty years after ; Resting yet confident of the verity thereof, and of his due call in detecting and reproving the wickedness. In his contents he saith, *As if he had falsely reported that some at that time were baptized naked* : To the Impartiall Examination whereof, I also freely joyn Issue with him.

Gods rule  
of report-  
ing and  
judging of  
others.

And in the first place do say, If he had it only by common fame and Report, as now he tells us, without any *knowledge* or *Experience* or *known just proof* ; I would Query with him, Whether by any Law of God or *Man*, he can Justify such a *hainous charge* wherein yet he persists with so much confidence and self-justification : for first, Doth not the Lord expressly tell us, *Exo. 23. 1. Thou shalt not Receive a false report : put not thy hand with the wicked to be an unrighteous witness* : ( which they do, that take up and publish false Reports ) the word is נִשְׁאֵל *inscipientes* : The direction being, that we make diligent *Enquiry*, and by good witnesses have the truth of the thing that is told us, *confirmed* as a *Certainty*, before we make report of it to others

other wherein the *Neighbors Name, life, Estate* is concerned, as *Deut. 17. 4.*—*And it be told thee and thou hast heard of it, and Enquired diligently, and behold it be true, and the thing certain that such an abomination is wrought, &c. Deut. 19. 15.* One witness shall not rise up against a man for any Iniquity; or for any sin; in any sin that he sinneth, at the Mouth of two Witnesses, or at the mouth of three witnesses, shall the matter be Established. And then in the case of reproaching and bearing of false witness, this is the Excellent Rule worthy to be written in Letters of Gold; *Deut. 19. 18.* *And the judges shall make diligent search, and behold, if the witness be a false witness; and hath testified falsely against his Brother, then shall you do unto him, as he had thought to have done unto his Brother, so shalt thou put the evil away from amongst you.* So that it is not common fame, but known approved witnesses, that, according to God's Law, must be the ground of our Receiving, spreading abroad, judging and Reproving our Brethrens Evils; for if that be admitted, Christ Jesus himself would be judged as a Wine-bibber and a Drunkard, a Blasphemer; and one that had a Devil, his followers to be the worst of men, who will have all Evil spoken against them for his Name; And what did not those honourable Worthies, the Waldenses, suffer in this Respect? common fame reputing them the greatest villains in the world, putting out of candles in their Meetings, and committing all manner of wickedness; &c.

Therefore

Mr. B's  
full con-  
sent to  
these Ex-  
cellent  
rules to  
his own  
just con-  
demnati-  
on.

Therefore to this point, before we go further, we will hear what Mr. Baxter himself saith in his *Christian Directory*, worthy his and our most serious Reflection; p. 156. *Fame is too ordinarily a liar and they shall be Lyars who will be its messenger: How know ye whether the thing you report is true? It is only because a credible person spoke it. But how did that person know it to be true? Might not he take it upon trust, as well as you? And might not he take a person to be credible, that is not? And how commonly doth faction, Interest, Passion, or Credulity make the person Incredible in one thing, who is credible in another, when he hath no such temptation; If you know it not to be true, or there be not sufficient Evidence to prove it, you are guilty of lying and slandering Interpretatively, though it should prove true, because it might have been a Lye for ought you know.*

Qu. How far may I censure upon the report of others? p. 157.

Ans. According to the degree of the Credibility of the persons, and Evidence of the Narrative; not simply in themselves, but as compared with all that is to be heard on the contrary part: else you are partial and unjust, and for the evil of rash judging and backbiting, which so much gratifies Satan, destroyes Christian love, yea, the souls of men. Read (saith he,) *Math. 7. 7. Rom. 14. 10. 13. Eph. 4. 31. 2 Cor. 12. 20. Rom. 1. 29. 30.*

Qu. May not I speak that which honest, Religious, credible persons do report, and that in the case of some that Countenance an ill cause, and whose dishonor would disable him to do hurt? p. 152.

Ans.

Ans. Not, without sufficient Evidence, and sufficient call: you may not belye the Devil, nor wrong the worst man that is, though under the pretence of doing good; God needeth not malice, nor calumnies, nor Injustice to his glory. It is an ill cause that cannot be maintained without such means as that: And when the matter is true, you must have a call to speak it, and you must speak it justly without unrighteous aggravations or hiding the better part, which should make the Case or person truly understood: But yet I must say, a great deal of villany and slander is committed upon this plausible pretence, and that there is scarce a more Common Cloak for the most inhumane lyes and Calumnies.

How farr Mr. Baxter hath sinned against the Lord in violating these known Rules given us, and his own declared judgment in the Case ( so soundly and Excellently drawn from the Word of God and Common Equity ) so unwarrantably to take up a false scandalous report, upon Common fame without competent Witnesses and enquiring of the accused, and yet to stand so in the justification thereof, is recommended to his conscience and the judicious Reader: But in the next place if we examine his Treatise that first published this calumny, we shall there finde him say more, declaring some other grounds which now he minceth, & would fain extenuate, and which proves but a further aggravation of the crime: he having told us in his 12. Chapter p. 134. of Blain Scripture, what a hainous sin dipping the person all over in cold water was, viz. No less than a breach of the 6th. Commandment,  
Thou

*Thou shalt not kill*, concludes his Chapter thus : viz. If *Murder* be a sin, than dipping Ordinarily in cold water over head in England, is a sin, &c. So having made us *Murderers* and not to be suffered in the Commonwealth, he proceeds in the next Chapter to render us *whoremongers* and *Adulterers* in the managing of our selves in that Ordinance, viz.

whar Mr  
B. sayth  
hereof in  
his plain  
Scripture  
proof, &c.

My Seventh Argument (sayth he) is also against another wickedness, in their manner of baptizing, which is their dipping persons naked, as it is very usual with many of them, or next to naked as is usual with the modestest that I have heard of, against which I argue thus : if it be a breach of the 7th Commandment (Thou shalt not commit adultery) Ordinarily to baptize Naked, then it is Intolcrable wickedness, and not Gods ordinance. And if they be next to naked, (viz. some clothes on, which he is pleased to tell you) that the modestest of them, as he hath heard, use to do viz. (that being hearsay, the other upon certainty) yet the difference is not great ; and the former Inconveniency would in a great measure follow, viz. of Adultery, publick scandals, debauching of the people, turning Gods worship into Contempt, &c. concluding thus, And so I leave the mention of this unsavoury practise ; which, were it not necessary to confute, I should not have medled with. But in both these last Cases, (viz. the Murder and Adultery of dipping naked) we dispute not against bare words, but Experiences and known practises ; For their naked Baptizing is a known thing, and the wickedness that hath followed on some. So  
Experience



then here is not *common fame* and *heresy* but *Experience* and *knowledge* declared to be the *Ground of his detection*, and *reproof* of his horrible wickedness. A proof thereof therefore is that which is called for by us from Mr *Baxter*: for this *Experience* and *knowledge* must either be his own, or to be made out by some *credible proof* upon the Rules before-given by himself, by parties on both sides, being present face to face, the *Accuser* and the *Accused*, without which he cannot possibly be *justified* in the publication of this *hainous thing* that so much accuseth and calls in Question the good-name, if not the lives, of his brethren,

As to his own knowledge, he tells you, in so many words, he never saw any dipt, either naked or otherwise, p. 283. 284. therefore it must be from some *known approved Evidence* that must justify all this positive confidence, and which being call'd for at his hand he now shrinks up, and tells us in this last *Piece*, he cannot produce any Evidence, but must refer us to *common fame*, and for which you must take the words of a *dying man*, that is not long to speak to any man on the earth.

Therefore whether this is not to cover *Iniquity* with great *Impiety*, is left to judgment:

But, to justify the common fame to be *Autentick*, he proves it by our *silence*, which gave consent in the case: for, inasmuch as none of themselves have for this 25. or. 26. years, denied or contradicted the same, it holds for good proof, and therefore he ought to be acquit of the slander.

Mr B.  
pleads the  
Anabap-  
tists silence  
to prove  
the charg

M

To

No good  
proof and  
why.

To which I say: either this confident, positive, assertion is true or false. If true, yet is not Mr Baxter justified by his own Rules before mentioned; for, a persons silence in the case of defamation will not warrant a judge to condemn an innocent person, upon common fame without due proof. *Our Saviour was silent, and held his peace at the false accusations brought in against him; as a sheep before the shearers, not opening his mouth, Math. 27. 12. 13. 14.* Some calumnies being so notoriously foolish and unnatural that they refute themselves, whereof this is one.

Those that  
witness'd  
against  
this cal-  
lummy at  
first.

But, if this prove false, How doth it then remove all his pretences, and bring greater guilt in all respects upon himself, thus covering himself by words of falsehood, *Job. 27. 34. Esa. 28. 15. Prov. 10. 15.*

Mr Fisher.

And that it is notoriously so, is my next work to demonstrate to you. Know therefore that his Treatise that brought forth this accusation was printed in 1650. or 1651. and after that 3. Impressions more; four in all, in five years space. And in the year 1652. *Samuel Fisher* printed his book, called, *Anti-Rantism in folio*, a Book not unknown to Mr. Baxter: Because you'll find in his poor *Students-Library*, part. 3. p. 926. amongst the Catalogue of *Polemical writings*, he adviseth the buying of, *Fishers Book against Infants Baptism* to acquaint him with the Nature of the controversy; so that he cannot plead Ignorance to the Book. And that that Book did complain in a high manner of this hainous Calumny of Mr. Baxter, let the Reader

Judge

Judge and let Mr. Baxter blush to Read, viz. Having in some pages of his book (going before what followeth) given a recital, word for word, of Mr. Baxters 12th and 13th. Chapter of the before-mentioned Treatise, contrayning several pages, viz. That about Murder and Adultery; and given a judicious return to each, doth in p. 410. thus express himself.

Good Lord! how is the practise of the truth made a Reproach unto thy people, and a division daily? for, I have heard the defaming of many, Report (say they) and we will report it, possess the Pulpit, and make the Priest believe it, and then all the Country shall ring out, and the people be soon Diabolized into the faith of it. But hear, ye rude reproachers of the people that are reprovers of the ways, whereby you run a whoring from the Lord; you shall not prevail by such flights, such plausible pretences; you shall be greatly ashamed; you shall not prosper, and unless you repent of belying the truth of God, your Everlasting confusion shall never be forgotten. It is too bad, to be credulous to flying reports; worse so violently to vent them, worst of all malevolently to Invent them: I dare not say, nor dare I deem Mr. Baxter to be guilty of the last; but of the two first I cannot clear him; sith that I perceive he takes it for a truth, that we ordinarily Dip naked, and thereupon disputes against it, as our usuall practise: And then, not confidently only, but of a certain, relate to the whole world; that it is no bare word, nor any doubtful thing, but an experience, a known practise: If he can clear himself he hath leave to do it for me, who also sum-

mons him in the name of Christ Jesus, whose true Disciples he hath done such despite to: (the Lord keep him from despising the spirit of Grace, the people of whose love are the people of his wrath) to prove it our practise, Ordinarily to dip naked, yet to produce but one instance of any women or maids that ever he saw dip naked in all his days, & I will abate him much of that I now accuse him of, in the Court of my Conscience. But if he say, as indeed he does in effect, that he never saw any dip at all, whilst (p. 134.) he sayes, that all that ever he saw baptized, had water poured on them: how can he say *Expertus loquor*, it is his experience, he having never so much as seen such a thing unless it were upon the Brazen-fac'd front of Featley's book, where he falsely, feignedly and filthily describes men and women dipping in that fashion; and there I believe he hath experienced it: or if he only hath it from the mouths of such as heard it from the mouths of others that never saw it, but receive it by Tradition as well as he, and that Originally too from the mouths of some that made it (and in such a manner very likely it was first bruted; for I am perswaded there was never such a thing done in England unless by some Arch-Knave, and arrant whore in way of Mockage to the Gospel, which is rather a glory then a shame to Christ his truth) then let M. Baxter bear the blame of his blinde-blaspheming the people of the Ever-living God.

Or, if he know indeed that such a thing as baptizing maids and men naked, hath been done in serious wise by any persons: I further challenge him

to make some proof of it, and to print the names of such men as have done it and such Maids and women that have suffered themselves to be dipp naked, and the names of such Credible Eye-witnesses as will testify it as in the sight of God, which if he can (though I shall not give place to him thereupon, so as to be satisfied thereby for his over-lashing in asserting it to be our practice to dipp naked, or for Condemning and denominating a whole party, much more their cause by the defects and abuses of some persons whom the cause disclayms; for then there were Twelve Devils because one among the Twelve, and then what an Angaan stable is your Church of England, by many members of which, Notorious Roguery is committed every hour?) yet I shall satisfy him so farr as to undertake, that the Church or Churches where such are, shall declare every such person as hath wrought such abomination, incommunicable without solemn Repentance for that fordid practice, or be themselves Incommunicable by all other Churches. But I believe he cannot do it. And if he cannot prove it to be our Ordinary known practise to dipp naked, That in the name of the Lord Jesus before whom he and I shall shortly both appear I entreat him, who as concerning zeal yet persecutes the Church of God, and powrs out Reproach upon them, that of an ignorant Saul he would become a searching, a seeing, a preaching Paul, of the faith which he hitherto destroys, &c. So now let all the world judge whether here was not one that besides my self within this 25. years deny'd and contradicted this malicious calumny and slander, I finde also that in the year 1653. that Hon-



4. M. Haggars witnesseth against it. *ry Hagger* in his book called *The Foundation of the Font uncovered* (in Answer to this calumny of Anabaptists baptizing naked, which Mr B. calls their breach of the 7th Commandment, *Thou shalt not commit adultery*, and therefore is intolerable wickedness and not Gods ordinance) sayth thus, p. 101, 102.

I am sure, it is an intolerable wickedness in Mr B. and a breach of the 9. Commandment, which sayth, *Thou shalt not beare false witness against thy Neighbour*, for him to say, *we baptize People naked*: And which till Mr B. prove, he doth but wickedly labour by saying all manner of evil on us falsely, to cast durt upon the truth of Christ. This book of Mr Haggars was (as a near Relation of his tells me) sent to Mr B. upon the publication thereof.

3. Mr. Tombes his witnesseth against it.

And 3dly Whereas Mr. B. sayth, that though Mr Tombes answer'd his book, yet he never deny'd the truth of the thing, p. 282: I desire, the Reader may take notice, what truth there is in that his positive assertion, and whether he did not give a sober and substantial witness against this horrid scandal also.

For you will find Mr Tombes in his *Precurſor*, (written An. 1651. the next year or the same year after Mr B's.) taking notice of the hainous charge of Murder and Adultery (in breach of the 6. and 7. Commandment he layes upon the Anabaptist for baptizing naked in cold water;) doth in p. 92. deny what Mr B. had sayd, and justifies dipping as used by the Anabaptists: Telling us, that their baptizings were seemly with coverings

verings fit to be quickly put off, when they came out of the water, and with meet provision for health of the person: And that there was no inconvenient thing done by them, either as to health or modesty; going in a penitent form, in course habits, not without grave company, nor staying a minute in the water.

And further as to the danger of Murder suggested, he sayth; It is refuted by frequent Experience of aged weak persons, men and women, baptized in cold stormy times, in the open air, in cold running water, without detriment to their health; Concluding, That he cannot therefore be of opinion, that the ordinary practise of baptizing, by dipping the whole body in cold water openly or privately, is either a breach of the 6. or 7. Command, unless he condemn Christ and his Apostles as appointing and practising a rite contrary to Gods Commandments.

And as to his satyrical, he had almost said (as well he might) scurrilous quibs, he would let them pass. And in p. 26. reckons that of baptizing maids naked among his prophane bitter passages, savouring more of a heathen Satyrist then a Christian preachers zealous spirit. So that here we have a witness against him au. 51. by M. Tombes. 52. by Sam. Fisher, and 53. by Henry Hagger. And whether from all that hath been sayd to detect Mr Baxters many Evils contracted herein, we should not reasonably expect now some proof of his Integrity in giving the satisfaction promised, viz. For this sin of belying others, which he owns to be such a Diabolical, unprofitable, and dreadful

S. B. 2.

dreadful kinde of folly; is left to his Conscience, in the sight of God and all men; only this further would I recommend to him to help on his repentance herein, viz. That he having rendred us such Murderers and not fit to live for practising that way and Order, which his own mouth and pen has since own'd to be the very order and way that Christ appointed and primitive Saints practised; That he will consult the Rule and his own Conscience, what further satisfaction he ought to give us, for that also, and which for the better help of his memory I shall give in the following contradictory Scheme.

Mr Baxter again't  
Dipping as no Or-  
dinance of God.

Mr Baxter for Dipping as  
an Ordinance of God.

M. B.'s no-  
torious  
contradi-  
ctions ha-  
ving writ  
for and a-  
gainst dip-  
ping in a  
very strang  
manner.

That to Dip per-  
sons over head in cold  
water as necessary, is  
a plain breach of the  
6th. Commandment;  
and no Ordinance of  
God, but a hainous  
sin.

That if Murder  
be a sin, then dipping  
ordinarily in cold  
water over head in  
England, is a sin; and  
if those who would  
make it mens Religi-

M. B. in his 2d Disp. p.  
70. tells us, *Quoad modum*, as  
to the manner it is commonly  
confest by us to the Anabaptists  
as our Commentators declare,  
that in the Apostles times the  
baptized were dipt over head  
in the water, and that this sig-  
nified their profession both of  
believing the burial and Re-  
surrection of Christ, and of  
their own present renouncing  
the world & flesh, or dying to  
sin & living to Christ, or rising  
again to newness of life, or be-  
ing buried and Risen with  
Christ,

on to Murder themselves and urge it on their consciences as their duty, are not to be suffered in a Common-wealth any more than high way-Murderers and Thieves; judge how these Anabaptists that teach the Necessity of such Dipping are to be suffered.

Christ, as the Apostle expounds it Col. 3. Rom. 6.

At the Glashouse-Lect. Jan. 17. 1673. Mortification is another thing than the world takes it to be, our very entrance into baptism signifies to be dead and buried, and if Baptism could, I had rather it should be used as it was at first, namely, to dip persons in water; however we must understand it a death and burial:

This withall must not be forgotten, That Mr B. makes dipping with some garments on, which he calls next to naked, not to be much different from quite naked, and that all the Inconveniences thereof, (*viz.* of being baptized naked) would follow; so that he now owning this way of dipping over-head in water to represent the death and burial with Christ, to be according to Christ's Command, doth, in effect, say, that Christ hath enjoined, and the saints and primitive Churches practised that (as he hath published in Print and not yet repented of) which is no less than Murder and Fornication, and to violate the 6th. and 7. Commandement. And what greater blasphemy and contradiction can one well be guilty of? The Reader is also desired to take notice, that Mr B. leans so much upon his own vindication and justification in this particular, That he makes it the great ground of writing

ting this his last book against us, as you'l find his own words in his preface import, viz. *Had not M. D. laid a necessity upon me, I had silently past over all his vain Reasonings, and all his accusations of my writings, and all his falsifications of Authors; Had he not called me so loud to repent of slandering some for being baptized naked. And when I found it my duty to speak to that, I thought it fit to say some what of the rest.* Therefore, may not what he has sayd of the rest, which is, it seems, in his esteem, the lesser, be judged by what he hath sayd to this the greater?

M.B's notorious slander of Sir H.V. and the Vanists, as saith Dr Stubbs.

And the better to further Repentance in Mr B. for this too much, I fear, reigning corruption of false accusing and calumniating persons and parties he hath a prejudice to; I must remember him of another old story, that upon this occasion may not be unprofitable to be remarkt to him, calling aloud for satisfaction from him, which is relating to the slanderous calumny he published of Sir H. Vane, and the Vanists in his *Key to Catholicks*; and which I finde urged upon him by two learned men, in whose words I shall express it. The first is, what I finde in Dr. Stubbs his letter to him in vindication of Sir Henry, who charges Mr B. to have published two Notorious falsehoods about him, The first was, that he had his hand in chief in the Kings death. And the 2d, that he was a Jesuite, and had been in Italy.

To the first, he sayth thus, p. 4. 6. *Whereas you Impudently tell the world in your late railing book, viz. Key of Catholicks p. 312. 13. 30. 31. That Sir H. Vane and the Vanists and levellers*



put the King to death being chief Agents therein, and that Sir Hen. was the Master of the game, and that he and his followers were no better than Papists and Jesuites: And having thus vented your self in a vain and frothy discourse, wherein perhaps you think you have sufficiently Answered the Papists, & vindicated the Protestant party touching the Kings death, by these manifest and gross untruths, as if it were lawful for you to speak wickedly for God, and to lye for his glory, Job. 31. 7. Rom. 3. 7. Did you ever see the face of this Gentleman, whom you have so frequently reproached ( neither Minister nor man-like )? or, at least, did you ever speak a word with him, either to know his judgment concerning the proceedings against the late King, or his principles in matters of Religion? I am confident, you did not know him. Neither had you ever any conference with him. Know therefore, that this is a manifest untruth, reflecting no small disparagement upon the Ministry, which for my part I honour and Reverence as a precious Ordinance of Christ, and am heartily sorry, that you and others should bring the same into contempt, by your bitterness, factiousness and ambitious designs and practices. That honourable Gentleman ( whom you calumniate, and from whom I believe you never received the least Injury, was not free to Act in Parliament nor in the High Court of Justice, upon the Garbling of the house by the Army, and the Triall of the King by Commissioners; but did thereupon ( as I remember ) retire and sequester himself from publick Employment, being not fully satisfied ( at that time ) of the proceedings of the Parliament and Army,

1. Of putting the King to death.

Army, and therefore How could this Gentleman have a chief hand in the death of the King? It concerns every man (and much more Ministers of the Gospel) to write the truth both in a Logical and Moral consideration; and to speak no otherwise then (he knows) the thing is; and not to utter an untruth, though he be Ignorant of it; whosoever loveth and maketh a lye, shall not Inherit the Kingdom of Heaven, Rev. 22. 15. And the Apostle exhorts us to put away Lying and every man to speak truth to his Neighbour, Eph. 4. 25.

4. That Sir H. was in Italy, & brought dangerous opinions from thence.

The other slanderous false accusation was, That the Papists are strong in England under the Mask of the Vanists, whereof you make him the Ringleader: That he was in Italy and brought from thence most wicked and corrupt Opinions; Another palpable untruth (which a meer Moral man, much more a true Christian, would be ashamed of): he never sojourned in Italy in all his life, and therefore could bring from thence neither sound nor corrupt Doctrine, nor is he willing that his eldest son should travel beyond the seas, lest his youth should be tainted with Corrupt opinions and Customs and practices of forreign popish Countries; so much is he in love with them. Judge now Mr B. whether you in this passage of your book faithfully discharged your duty towards your Neighbour, and have done the same to him, which you would have another to have done to you.

Dr Pierce improving Mr B. for this slander.

And to this purpose, Dr. Pierce in his Pre-advvertisement saith, I hope his calumnies of Grotius and the Episcopal Divines, will now obtain the less credit with his most credulous admirers, for that he hath

hath poured out the same (and a great deal worse)  
 against a person of great remark amongst the Coun-  
 sellors of State: the Vane or Vainits (for he is  
 pleased to speak in both Dialects) are made the  
 burdens of his Invektive; in his Key for Catho-  
 licks: Who sayth, that the Parliament should have  
 been awaked to a wise and Godly jealousy of the  
 Counsellors and designs of him that was in New-  
 England the Master of the Game, and to have  
 carefully searched how much of his Doctrines and  
 designs were from Heaven, and how much of them  
 he brought with him from Italy, or, at least, was be-  
 gotten by the progenitor of Monsters. And lest his  
 Reader should be so ferk on whom he fastens such ug-  
 ly Calumnies, he frequently nameth, p. 319. 329.  
 335. Sir Hen. Vane, neither regarding the Quali-  
 ty, or learned parts of that Knight, nor any the  
 least Reverence or care of truth. Sir Hen. whom  
 he supposeth, p. 331. to have brought Corrupt o-  
 pinions out of Italy, was, in truth, as appears, ne-  
 ver there, and further sayth, I cannot tell what  
 judgment that learned Gentleman may be of, but he  
 hath this Commendation as well as Grotius, That  
 he is aimed by M. Baxter beyond all measure; which  
 story we shall conclude in Dr Stubbs his seri-  
 ous words, which I desire Mr B. may lay to  
 heart, p. 4. If he be a slanderer who wrongs his  
 Neighbours credit, either by unjust raising or up-  
 holding an evil report against him; surely you have applicati-  
 on to  
 cause to lay your hand upon your heart ~~and~~ to take  
 shame to your self: And if this be the mark of those  
 that shall dwell in the Lord's Tabernacle, that they  
 are such that neither raise nor take up a reproach  
 against

Dr Stubbs  
 his solemn  
 applicati-  
 on to  
 Mr B.

against their Neighbour, Psal. 15. 3. *What will become of you Mr B. and where and with whom must you dwell to Eternity; if God do not humble you for your slanderous and lying tongue and Pen?* It may be Mr B. will tell you, he had this upon common fame too, but concerning report upon such evidence, Mr B. hath already judged; but to prevent his alligation of never being admonished hereof I have given you his two Monitors. But it is probable, he will say, this was long since, and why should such old stories be rip't up? To which, we must tell him what the Maxim of the law is, *viz. Nullum tempus occurrit Regi*: If a man be Indited 20. or 30. years after the fact supposed to be committed, for Felony, Murther or Treason, if he doth not acquit himself by good Evidence upon the tryal, he dyes for it. But, however it holds good in the Laws of men, to be sure it is firm in Gods laws; That, if Repentance and satisfaction be not made to the Neighbour for such Immoralities here, God will take the vengeance and satisfaction to his justice hereafter; which with the 15. Psal. before-minded, *Math. 5. 22.* and *1 Jo. 3. 15.* will be worthy of his most serious consideration; *Whosoever is Angry with his Brother without a cause, shall be in danger of the judgment, &c. Whosoever hateth his Brother is a Murderer, and we know that no Murderer hath eternal life abiding in him.*

## CHAP. II.

Wherein you have M. Baxters manifold contradictions confirmed.

**I**N reference to which, M. B. expresseth much Mr B. justifies himself. keeness, telling me, I speak evil of things I understand not, that I am therein guilty of hard-facts falsehoods, confidently obtruded on the ignorant about publick and visible matter of fact; And, though, he hopes, one fearing God, yet erring therein through ignorance, passion and temerity, though it may be he shall be told ere-long, that the most brazen fact Ljars may be Saints, p. 292.

Then comes to the particulars: And first, that I speak falsely in saying, Nonconformists are so Non-conformists not offended with him as he saith. much offended with those passages in his Christian Directory collected by me, so many having approved thereof both before and since it was printed.

But what cause of offence was thereby given to all Nonconformists and Protestants also, will better appear when we come to the examination of those particulars, and to which we must refer you for an answer to him or any that may flatter him therein.

The next thing he rages at, is, for my confirming that he has been sometimes, as you may find, a great opposer; then, a great defender of Episcopacy; witnessing his contradictory way of writing: Pref. Ed. 1. Concerning which Mr B. first against since for Episcopacy. he saith, p. 298. that, This falsehood did unhappily Mr B. denies the same. overslip him; my writing being so full a confutation

of



of it, that he can have nothing of sense to say to cloak it. As my dispute about Church-Government, published 1658. demonstrates; Either this man knew me, and my writings herein, or not; If not, what a man is this, that dares talk thus confidently and falsely of what he knows not: If he did, then how much more flagitious is his practice, thus to tell the world an untruth, so notorious to himself. He sayth [as you may finde] but never tells you where and when I ever defended the Episcopacy which I had opposed.

The  
charge  
made  
good.

In answer whereto, that I may make good my charge and free my self from the hainous crime charged, of being such a flagitious person; you must know in the first place, that by the Episcopacy that I affirm he has so contradictiously been for, and against, I mean that Episcopal Order, Government, Religion and Worship, that, by the Lyrurgy, and Canons, has been managed by acts of Parliament in the Church of England by the Prelacy; in distinction from Presbytery, that, by the directory, managed their Government by Ordinance and Act of Parliament.

Then in the next place, I shall shew you; first, what I finde in his writings against the English Prelacy their government and service, (both in their Dioceses and Parishes,) and how as he saith inconsistent, to discipline and Piety, (the ends of government,) and for separation from them.

2dly, How he hath owned and pleaded for, that Prelatical way and Religion he has so opposed and contemned.

To the first; a to the opposition he has given to our English Prelacy, that is notoriously to be seen in his *Five Disputes* (a book yet justified and not recanted) out of which I must produce some particular Instances to make good that my first head. Wherein he gives divers Arguments, why the then extruded Episcopacy should not be restored; some of the heads whereof I shall give you, viz. First, because it destroyeth, (he tells us,) government it self and the ends thereof: As being impossible to be managed either in the Diocesses in general, or Parishes in particular, where the Minister hath neither power of Excommunication or absolution, all lying in the Bishop: which he makes good by diverse Arguments, p. 32. &c. Secondly, it was a government that gratified the Devil and wicked men, p. 36. Thirdly, that it did unavoidably cause divisions. p. 37. Fourthly, The product of Pride, p. 45. Fifthly, Gratified lazy Ministers, p. 46. Sixthly, Not of God's institution. p. 48. Seventhly, Contrary to Gods word. p. 51. &c.

1. That M. B. opposed the Episcopal Government,

M.B's several Arguments against Episcopacy,

And further in his preface, he thus expresseth himself, p. 16. &c. I have here given you some Arguments, to prove your Prelacy, which was cast off, to be against the will of Christ, and the welfare of the Churches: And I shall not believe, that it's Schism, to be against sin and the Churches ruine, and therefore just before suggesting that we are no more Schismaticks, in being against Prelacy than against Papacy, which by others is thought the best form; And I cannot but admire, to read in your writings, that Discipline and Piety

No more schism to be against Prelacy then Popery.

Prelacy  
destroys  
piety and  
discipline.

pretended by you, as the thing which you promote, & we (*viz.* we Presbyters or Puritans, conforming to the Directory); when I am most certain, that the destruction of Piety and Discipline are the very things by which you have so much offended your brethren; and we would heartily come as near you as we can, so that piety and discipline may not be destroyed. We talk not now to you of matters that are known by hear-say: we see, which way promoteth piety, and which destroyeth it: we see, that most of the ungodly in the Land are the forwardest for your waies. You may have almost all the Drunkards, Blasphemers, and ignorant haters of Godliness in the Country to vote for you; and, if they durst, again to fight for you at any time. I know, the common sense of most that are serious in practical Christianity, is against your formal waies of worship in the course you have taken.

Mr B. opposes  
the  
Common-  
Prayer.

And in the Savoy-Dispute, p. 9. speaking of the common-Prayer. Cold prayers are like to have a cold return, and therefore even for peace-sake, let us pray more heartily and copiously, than the Common-prayer-book will help us to do. And, whether this be the cause, or whether it be the Common-prayer-book hath never a prayer for it self, we find that its prayers prevail not to reconcile many sober serious persons to it, that live in faithful prayer.

5. Disp. 373. To prescribe a form of prayer and to lay a necessity in it as to the thing it self or the Churches peace, and to punish, silence, suspend, excommunicate or reproach as schismaticks the able godly peaceable Ministers and people who dare not use it, is such a sin that ought not to be. And this  
use

was the great sin of the late Magistrates and Prelates in England, and it is the main difference between their party and others at this day. And p. 376. What intolerable pride is this, for a few Bishops to think so highly of themselves, and so basely of their more judicious Brethren, as if no man must speak to God but in their words. What abundance of ignorant drunken Readers, and other Ministers, were sufferd in England; while the learned, Godly, painful Ministers were cast out, and silenced, and persecuted, because they would not conform to all the forms and ceremonies imposed by the Bishops? And so how many thousand souls may we think are gone to hell through the ignorance or ungodliness of their guides; as if their damnation were more desirable, than their salvation, by the teaching of Ministers that dare not use the Common-prayer-book and ceremonies? Had not the Church a sure rule and happy order, and unity and peace before your common-prayer-book and ceremonies were born? why must the Church have no peace but upon such terms? who made this necessity, that all men must be taken for intollerable Schismaticks, that dare not stint themselves in the publick worship by your impositions. Will you not be confounded before God, when these Questions must be answer'd? The Church might have kept both peace, and her Pastors, if you had left all alone as the Apostles left it; and had not turn'd the form of your devotions to be a snare for others; p. 378. If none of these reasons will allay the imperious distemper of the proud, but she must needs, by an usurped legislation, domineer over mens Consci-

ences and the Church of God; we must leave them to him, who being the Lord and law-giver of his Church is jealous of his prerogative, and abhorreth Idols and will not give his glory to another, and delighteth to put down the proud.

Then, he goes on in the preface, p. 17. The spirit of Prophaneſs complict with you, doeth on you, in all places that ever I was acquainted with: bear with plain truth, it is in a cause of everlasting consequence: and p. 18. [owning the worser sort of people may be for Common-prayer, Cure. p. 200.] If a man had but mildly askt a swearer, or a Drunkard why he would be drunk? or had once named scripture or the life to come, unless prophanely: the first word he should hear was [O you are one of the holy Brethren, you would not drink or swear, but you will do worse in secret; It was never a good world since there was so much talk of Scripture and Religion, but the King and the Bishops will take an order with you, and all the Puritans and Precisians in the Land]: I profess upon my common experience, this was the common Language, and these were the men they call'd Puritans, and on such accounts. And what could the Prelats and Preachers of the Land have done more to mens Damnation, than to preach them into a hatred of Puritanism? when it was known by all that lived amongst them that piety was Puritanism in their account, and no man was so free from it, as he that would scorn at holiness, drink and swear, as if he had defyed God. This is true, and England knows it.

And p. 256. It was safer in any place that ever he knew, for men to live in constant swearing, cursing



sing and drunkenness, than to have instructed a man's family on the Lord's day.

And in *Grot. Religion*. p. 113. The cause of Episcopacy is because it was a shadow, if not a shelter, to the prophane, and did not trouble them with Discipline, and because they troubled and kept under the Puritans, whom they hated; and by not exercising discipline amongst them, your Churches would become the sink of all other Churches about you, to receive the filth they all cast out, and so became so great a reproach to Episcopacy, that would make it vile in the eyes of all sober men; so that a Prelatical Church would in the common account be near-a-kin to an Ale-house or Tavern, to say no more. So that, for my part, were I your enemy, I would wish you a Toleration; but being truly a friend to the Church and you, I shall make a better motion, &c.

Which is railing (saith Dr. Pierce *ibid.* p. 242.) D. Pierce both without and against reason, as well as beside complaint of M. B's and against your own knowledge; as if it were your railing against them and their way design to be noted for an ill man, and never more to be heeded in what you say. And further p. 220. Complaining against M. B. for reviling of them, saith thus. The ternary of Epethites which you discharge against the Prelatits, viz. Ignorant, Drunken, Worldly, I shall only leave you to lick up again at leisure, and entreat you, for the future, to leave your railing: The Quaker may thank you for joyning with him in bringing the Priesthood into disgrace.

And further to testifie what a good opinion he had of the Episcoparians, the Dr. further tells

him, p. 59. You had said enough, had you said no more than that you would rather choose to die in the state of David, whilst yet impenitently lying in Adultery and Murder and other deliberate impieties, than in the state of an Episcopal Divine; naming me, whom you acknowledged to be free from any such sin.

And Mr. Bagshaw accusing him of loading the persecuted with reproaches whilst he never mentions their persecutors, viz. the Bishops, but with honour,

Mr. Baxter replies. If it was possible for you to believe your own words, that I never mention them but with honor; I shall think, that there are few things that you may not possibly believe. Reader, if you peruse the book and yet believe this Author, I am not capable of satisfying thee in this; nor will I undertake it in any thing else. Are these terms of honour: Pref. p. 18. (How long Lord must thy Church and cause be in the hands of unexperienced furious fools who know not what holiness or healing is, but think that victory over mens bodies must be the cure of their souls, and that hurting them is the way to win their love. If Mr. B. did not mean the Bishops herein, he is desired to explain himself, which seems so to be understood.

And these are some few instances; which may, I think, prove that Mr. B. hath writ against the Episcopal way to the purpose; which he affirms doth destroy government and the ends thereof; gratifies the Devil and wicked men; destroys piety and discipline; a shelter and harbour to

all manner of vice and impiety; upholds formal waies of worship; cold unprevailant prayers in their common-prayer; a filthy sink, near a kin to an Ale-house or Tavern if not a—— That neither the Dioceſan or Pariſh Church can poſſibly maintain order or Diſcipline. No more Schiſm to oppoſe it, than the pacacy.

And truly I think, if theſe things be ſo which Mr B. hath affirmed, the Biſhops themſelves may be made Judges whether they ought to be reputed ſinful dividers, that ſeparate from them and their Churches.

Having thus proved the firſt part, the oppoſition he has made againſt Episcopacy; let us ſee, in the next place, what is to be gathered from his own writings, and the writings of others, to prove that he hath ſpoken for the Episcopacy he hath ſo contemned and vilified. Not to inſiſt upon the Owning given to the preſent Biſhops, and Archbiſhops in the Savoy-conference, viz. in calling them *The ſpecial Guides, and Right-Reverend fathers of the Church.*

We ſhall begin with an inſtance he himſelf gives us, out of the *Church told*, p. 14. ſpeaking of his book of the 5. Diſput. of Government, ſaith, *Is it not a ſtrange fate that this poor Book incurreth, that the men of both ſides read it as for them, and commend it, whiſt they condemn the Author, as if he were himſelf againſt it. The reverend Biſhop whom Mr. Bagshaw wrote againſt (viz. the Biſhop of Worceſter), alledged it in the greateſt audience, before his Maſteſty, Dukes, Lords and Biſhops, with no leſs commendation than*

2ly That  
M.B. hath  
ſpoken for  
the Episcopacy  
he wrote  
againſt.

1 M.B.  
himſelf  
Proves it.

these words [ that no man hath spoken better of this than Mr. Baxter ] And now Mr. Bagshaw citeth it with applause, the Bish p is for my Book Mr. Bagshaw is for it, &c. Mr. Bagshaw concluding it seems, as I do, that Mr. B. had writ much against Episcopacy, and the Bishop concluding that in the same book he had said much for it, and which I think is a knot easily untied, both being very true; M. B. in the same Book speaking so much for that which also he wrote so much against, the contradiction not lying in the Reader but the Writer : the verity whereof Dr. Pierce doth further confirm to us, makes it good against him in several particulars

pag. 173. *ibid.* You have written for and against the Directory as well as for and against the Common-prayer, and against the very covenant which you pretend to be for, and Episcopacy it self which you covenanted against, which may lay a suspicion that you have gotten a dispensation to use your tongue and pen as you see occasion; you having been for and against the Papists, as well as for and against the Presbyterians, or, &c. And, p. 126. Nay what Christian in the world, do not you justify and condemn, as present interest and passion do chance to serve you.

But further, To make good, how farr he justified the Church of England he had deserted, he tells you, p. 212. Out of his 5. Dispute, how farr Mr B. who had so much reproach't the Church, declared to own and comply with her : Particularly, that he professes, not only to be for Prelacy, but that he acknowledged a stined Liturgy to be lawful and ordinarily necessary, p. 258. That

he was for wearing the Surplice, if the Magistrate commanded it, 409. 410. For kneeling at the Sacrament p. 411. For the Ring in Marriage. 411. For Organs and Instruments of Musick in God's worship. p. 412. For holy-daies as the Magistrate appoints. 412. Tea, for the observation of the great holy-daies of the Church, viz. such as celebrate the memorial of Christs nativity, Circumcision, Fasting, Transfiguration, Ascension, and the like. 417. For the name and form of an Altar, name of Priest, & Sacrifice, and, as he thinks, lawfully. p. 417. that he will not condemn nor say that the Cross in Baptism is unlawful nor make any disturbance about it, &c. Then thus applies to him, After all these acknowledgments and more in other places, I wonder how you can excuse your departure from us? Will not you live in communion with us, because we observe the rites and orders of the Church which you confess to be very innoeent? or do you abandon what is innocent because we use it?

Now when you have seemed to have profited in coming up so farr, as hath been shewed, to the most disputable things of the Church of England: what can you stand of at so great a distance for? I pray you, saith the Doctor, return to us in time, rather than wish you had done it when 'tis too late.

And, again p. 223. If the Bishops you were against, did differ so little as you pretend from those Bishops which you are for; why was the publick peace broke for private Interest and ends?

Mr Baxter was for Archbishops as well as they; only would have the power of the Diocesan put into the Parish, and so have a Bishop



in every Parish instead of every Diocese. And though he own'd himself at a great distance from those he calls the new Episcopal Clergy because they so much fell in with the *Grotian* designe to introduce Popery and Libertinism, yet he had a reverend regard to the old Episcopal Divines. Though to that, Bish. *Bramhall* tells us, in his book, call'd, The vindication of himself and Episcopal Clergy from the Presbyterian charge of popery, as managed by M. B. in his *Grotian-Religion* p. 49.

Dr  
Bramhall  
proves it.

He (viz. Mr B.) would persuade us that there are two sorts of Episcopal Divines in England, the old and the new; and that there is much more difference between the old and the new, than between the old and the Presbyterians. ver. 67. Oh confidence, whither wilt thou? what is the power of prejudice and pride? the contrary is as clear as the light. We maintain their old Liturgy, their old Ordinal, their old Articles, their old Canons, their old Laws, practices, and prescriptions; their old Doctrine and Discipline against them. Then tell us no more, of old Episcopal Divines and new Episcopal Divines; we are all old Divines, one and all; out of his own words, I condemn him. The old sort of Episcopal Divines that receiv'd the publick Doctrine of the Nation in the 39. Articles, Homilies &c. I wholly acquitted from my jealousies, &c.

And as a further confirmation of this his contradiction by owning and pleading for that Episcopal way, worship and service, which before he had so slighted, vilified and condemned for their corruption, and that it was no more schism

to

to oppose them than the Papacy, take the following instances.

4. Mr. B. further confirms it.

*First*, In his zealous espousing and pleading for the Prelatical parish-Ministry, as great upholders of the Christian Religion and Protestant cause, as well as Bulwarks against Atheism, as his book call'd the Cure of Church divisions, and the three other written in the defence of it, amply testify. Though he knows they are not otherwise confirmed in their Parish relation, than as they own, and partake of Episcopal Ordination; swear Canonical obedience in subjection to their Ordinary, the Bishop of the *Diocess*, and as renouncing the Covenant that so engaged against the *Hierarchy*; And, whom he had so much disowned for abettors of Popery and Prophaness, and as being so little capable (if they had wills to it) to manage any order, Discipline or Government.

1. owning the Parish Ministry.

Secondly, his voluntary and actual conjunction and confederacy with the Parish-Churches, in their worship and service, though part of the *Diocesan* Church, and managed in chief by the Bishop thereof, who keeps the keys having the sole power of Excommunication and absolution in his own hand, according to the Canons, as Mr. B. himself informs; and therefore no possibility to attain any Gospel order, Rule or Government therein, and which therefore becomes such a sink of Impiety.

2. Communion with the Parish Churches

And, that he hath actual fellowship and communion with the Parish Church, as well as prelatical Ministry, may appear.

*First*

First, by his personal communicating with them in their Parish-worship, as agreeable to the Liturgy and practice of the Church of *England*, as,

First, in maintaining fellowship in the common-prayer, that he might thereby remove scandal and offence, and not harden the separatists in their way of separation, and error, and to displease them and cross their opinion, in his *Cure of Chur. Divis.* p. 135. though, as he own'd, so many sober serious persons could not for its coldness and formality be reconcil'd to it, which the worst of the people fell in with, and for which so many able godly peaceable Ministers, and people have been silenced, Excommunicated, and reproacht; so intolerably proud were the Bishops to think none must speak to God, but in their words. 5. Disput. p. 373. 376.

Secondly, by his declared Repentance for speaking so *sarcastically* and *deridingly* as he hath done of the Common-prayer, *Defen.* p. 70.

Thirdly, and especially, by that solemn declaration under his hand, to own the worship enjoined in the *Lyturgy*, upon the late appearing against Conventicles, which Mr B. left with his Clark at his meeting-house in Pell-mell-fields, and which you have word for word as followeth, *viz.*

M.B.'s declaration for the Liturgy.

*Though when I began to preach in this place, I publicly professed that the notorious necessity of the People, who are more then the parish-Church can hold, moved me thereto; and that we met not in opposition to, or separation from, the publique profession:*

*cession: And that we met not under colour or pretence of any Religious exercise in other manner than according to the Liturgie and practice of the Church of England, and that were I able, I would accordingly read the same.*

Jan. 30. 1674. R. B.

This left by Mr B. with his Clark  
for all persons to read publickly.

And this is that *Richard Baxter*, that not only has said so much against the use of *Lyturgies* in general, but especially so much against our *English Liturgie*, in particular, of which I shall give you some account, as I finde them in the proceedings of the *Commissioners* appointed by the King, for the Review of the book of *Common-prayer*, printed Anno. 1661. viz.

In P. 11. of the Exceptions, It is said, *We have in obedience to his Majesties Commission made enquiry but cannot finde any Records of known credit, concerning any intire forms of Liturgies within the first 300. years, which are confest to be as the most primitive, so the purest ages of the Church; nor any imposition of Liturgies upon any National Church, for some hundred years after. We find some Liturgy call forms fathered upon S. Basil, S. Chrysostome, and S. Ambrose: but we have not seen any Copyes of them, but such as give us sufficient evidence, to conclude them either wholly spurious, or so interpolated that we cannot make a Judgment what in them hath any Primitive Authority.*

No Liturgy the first 303. years.

And in p. 4. of the second part, Rejoyning to the Bishops Answers, does further say, *If a Liturgy*

No Liturgy in the Apostles times.

*Liturgy had been Indited by the Apostles for the Churches, being by Universal officers inspired by the holy Ghost, and of so Universal use, it would have been used and preserved by the Church, as the holy Scriptures were: But so it was not, Ergo no such Liturgy was indited by them for the Churches; the Holy Scripture is silent in these matters; It is apparent, therefore, that the Churches then had no Lyrurgie, but took liberty of Extemporate expressions, and spoke in the things of God, as men do in other matters, with a natural plainness and seriousness, suiting their expressions to the subjects and occasions.*

None in the 2d & 3d ages.

*And though Divisions began to disturb their peace and holy orders; the Apostle, instead of prescribing them a form of Divine Service, for their unity and concord; does exhort them, to use their gifts and liberties aright, and speak the same thing for matter, avoiding disagreements, though they used not the same words.*

60 Exceptions against the Liturgy.

*Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and others, sufficiently intimate to us, that the Churches quickly after the Apostles did use the personal Abilities of their Pastors in prayer, and give us no hint of any such Liturgie of Apostolical fabrication and imposition, and therefore doubtless there was nothing for it could have been so soon lost or neglected, &c.*

*And as to the Liturgy of the Church of England, they give in to the Bishops 60. Exceptions, comprehending the mischiefs, absurdities, corruptions, disorders, defects, superfluities, falsehoods, and superstitions, that called for Reformation therein; Complaining what a sad cause*  
of



of Division it had been, and what calamity it had brought upon thousands who had departed the land, [ to avoid its corruptions ; ] and to the many thousands also, that suffered at home, [ rather than be defiled therewith ] pag. 7. which varies so little from the Romish forms before in use, and which was so done by designe to win upon the Papists themselves, in the first forming of it, pag. 3. part. 1. Protesting before God and man against the dose of Opium which they therein prescribe, which they tell them plainly tended to cure the disease by extinguishing of life, and to unite us all in a dead Religion. p. 23.

Liturgies  
unite to a  
dead Reli-  
gion.

And in pag. 55. tells them, that they may as well make a Coat for the Moon, as to make a Liturgy that shall be sufficiently suited to the variety of places, times, subjects, accidents, without the Liberty of intermixing such prayers or exhortations, as alterations and diversities require.

And that Mr B. had his hand in chief in the drawing up, and managing this affair, he spares not to tell us again and again; particularly in his last book. Cath. Theol. 13. Conf. p. 285.

That he had been put on to plead the Nonconformists cause in the costliest circumstances, and to bear the greatest odium; viz. In this conference.

Yet this is he; Notwithstanding all these exceptions yet unanswered, who has gone into this Liturgical service, declaring under his hand, That he will not meet under colour or pretence of any Religious exercise in other manner, than according to the Liturgy and practise of the Church of England.

Secondly,

2. Conforming to the Episcopal Ceremonies.

*Secondly*, By owning and conforming, as Dr *Pieter* observes, to so many of the most contro- versal Rites and ceremonies of the Church, and to which you have a greater addition in the *Christian Directory*, so that by subscribing to the Liturgy and practise of the Church of England, doth not he subscribe to all?

3. By communicating with the Episcopal Parishes, and why.

*Thirdly*, by communicating with the parish- Churches in the Sacrament of the Lord's sup- per, receiving upon his knees, as the Church ap- points ( a Gesture he so much opposeth as anti- scriptural, p.21. par.1. of the *Savoy Proceedings*, p.75. 2. part. And yet again for kneeling if the Church enjoin it, *Christian Direct.* p. 859.) with his declared Reason thereof; And why done in the most publick manner he could in the Citty, at Easter, viz. 1st. because he might not be a scandal to our Governours, nor to any sober con- formable men. 2dly, To acquit himself from being a Peevish Divider in following parties, and passion, rather than Conscience: And 3dly, To acquit the Nonconformists of such misjudgings, some being tempted by his omission to think so of them. 2. Ad- mon. p. 77.

4. By his severe cen- suring the the Non- confor- mists to Episcopa- cy.

*Fourthly*, by his zealous endeavours to pro- voke all the dissenters, and Non-conformists to follow him in this his conformity; as by the ma- nifold Arguments in those said books appears, which he presseth with great earnestnesse; where- of I shall give you a few of them viz.

1. Because they that incline to separation from the parish worship, are peevish, ignorant, self con- ceited Christians, *Cure.* p.142. 212. Though he tells

tells us before that the most able, conscientious, serious and sober Christians suffered for the same, *Grotian Relig.* The most learned, Godly, powerful, painful, peaceable men, durst not use their ceremonies. 196. Bishop *Brambul.*

2dly, *Because it is too much in affinity with the spirit of the Quakers, to declaim against the sinfulness of Parish-assemblies and communion, and of forms of prayer, and such like, till they have frightened the ignorant into their mistaken zeal, Cure* p. 152. Yet tells us how many thousand Conscientious Christians left the land to avoid the corruptions of that Worship, and how many thousands suffered also at home, whom he so scornfully reviles.

3dly, *From Gods dreadfull judgments that have befallen some high professing Separatists, who have dyed Apostate Infidells, Cure,* p. 268.

And did not dreadfull judgments befall *Corah Dathan, &c.* in the old ? *Judas, Ananias &c.* in the New Testament, who were high professing separatists ?

And if this be good arguing, what shall we say to the many dreadfull judgments, that the Books of prodigies tell us, have befallen some high professing separatists, who have dyed Apostate Conformists ?

4ly, *Because the spirit of separation, is the same with the spirit of persecution, because they are persecuted who are causelessly separated from, Cure,* p. 259. 260. &c. And therefore, *Babylon* being Judge, (that they who by the Lords Command have separated from her, have done it causeless-

ly) they ought to be justified in all their violence and cruelty, that they have exercised to their Non-conformists, the sin of separation being of so deep a dye.

3dly, *Because separation is an infectious thing, and draws many after them, like sheep that break over the fold.* *Church*, p. 219. The quite contrary being true, there being no other way to be preserved from infection but separation from the ways of sin and Antichristian pollutions; *Revi* 18: 4. *2 Cor.* 6. *1 Cor.* 5.

4thly, *Because separation, and Church divisions &c. is the crying sin; all the judgments in the nation being to be charged upon it.* p. 3. *Ch.* told. And thus being intoxicated with the Whore's cup, doth he talk like a drunken man, bereaved of his senses, calling good evil and evil good; duty sin, and sin duty.

Though, by the way, it must not be forgotten, that, notwithstanding he exacts our Parish Communion with such severity; yet is he pleased, out of his great Clemency, though in contradiction hereto, to vouchsafe some indulgence in the point, thanks to Mr. *Bagshaw* for his help therein (who notwithstanding Mr. *Baxter* so much scorned and condemned, yet did he force him to repentance 5 or 6 times in that his contest with him, and compelled him thus at last to give him the whole controversy): who in *Church Told*. p. 7. is pleased to allow these peevish ignorant self conceited separatists these following favours. 1st. *To relax to them the use of Ceremonies.* 2dly, *That they shall choose whether*

M. B. contradicts himself again.

they

they will communicate with any persecutor. 3ly To have their liberty whosoever they will own Diocesans, 4ly Or to communicate with or own a Diocesan Church, or to Communicate with any ignorant Scandalous, or heretical Parish Minister: 6 Not to do any sinful action by word or deed to procure it. 7. Nor to communicate with a worse Church or Minister, when they may have a better, &c.

Now who would not think, that that man is distracted who talks at such a rate; let him make his words good; and the controversy is at an end; there is no more askt nor praclised that I know of. And it is upon no other ground, that conscientious men separate from the Parishes, but upon them here mentioned, *et c.* That they may do no sinful action in word or deed, and not Communicate with a worse Church, and Minister, when they may have a better: therefore what has the man meant to rage, and fret, and fume at men, for doing the thing he so allows and tolerates?

But, in the next place, lest he be judged himself for the latitude he takes, and that he might be an example, and give relief to streightned consciences, and teach men to keep themselves out of harms way, and to be no more nice than wise; he is pleased by the art of Sophism to tell us, That if we have Communion with wicked men and Ministers in the Lords supper, and in their Parish-worship, we are not defiled thereby; And that we are not guilty of the fault of other mens worship with whom we joyn; no, not of Ministers or Congregations, more then God himself, that

Latitudinarian are.



knows all the sins of the godly, and yet is present at their Prayers, and holds Communion with them, and rejects them not for such failings, Care, p.195. 200.

But Christ having taught us other doctrine, it is better to hear him then Mr B. For he tells us, That a little leaven doth leaven the whole lump, 1 Cor. 5.6. Therefore v. 11. If any that is called a Brother, be a fornicator, or covetous, or an Idoler, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner, with such an one, no not to eat. And 2 Cor. 6. Christ commands us, not to be unequally yoked together with unbelievers, for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness, and what communion hath light with darkness, &c. therefore, to come out from among them and to be separate, and not to touch the unclean thing, &c. And Eph. 5. 11. To have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but to reprove them rather. Rev. 18. 4. come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, & that ye receive not of her plagues. And for the Blasphemy of that later assertion, Mr Bagshaw did well correct him for it, and to which he gave him little or no return. Secondly, our learned Casuist, by the vertue of quiddity, gives us a notable lift at another pinch, to help us to save our bacon, telling us, That we may own our Parishioners as Christians, that of Diocesan and Parish-relation, being accidental, the other the essentials of Communion, they being of the Universal Church. 2 Admon. p.91. But doth the Kings Law or Bishops tell us so? and doth the Scripture give us any such allowanc?

And

And with this Jesuitical distinction, mental reservation, & equivocation, What Popish Church especially in *France* may we not hold Communion with? He being pleased, in his *Grotian Relig.* p. 10, as Bishop *Bramhal*, p. 35. in his answer observes, to tell us, That *Cassander Thaulerius*, & *Ferus*, are blessed souls with Christ, & that he esteems the French Nation to be not only not an erroneous, but an honourable part of the Church of Christ; and therefore saith the Bishop, I know no man who honours the Church of Rome more than himself.

Lastly, you have Mr *B.* making us a kind of repentance, which seems to make the Bishops and Church of *England* amends for all his harsh dealing with them; and which you have in his 2 *Admonition*. p. 51. 52. printed 1671. viz.

I do hereby freely profess that I repent of all that ever I thought, said, wrote, or did since I was born, against the peace of the Church or State; Against the King, his person or Authority, as supreme in himself or as derivative in any of his officers (viz. Bishops and Archbishops deriving from him) Magistrates or any commissioned by him. And that I repent that I no more discouraged the spirit of peevish quarrelling with superiours and Church-orders, [ Arch-Bishops, Bishops, Deans, Arch-Deacons, Parsons, Vicars, Curates, &c. ] And though I ever disliked and opposed it [ viz. such peevish quarrelling ] yet that I sometimes did too much encourage such as were of this temper, by speaking too sharply against those things which I thought to be Church-corruptions: [ it seems, it is now but

M.B.'s hypocritical mock-repentance.

thought so to be, not that it was such a tavern and ale-house, such an *Augean* stable, that he made it to be ]: and was too loath to displease the contentious, for fear of being incapable of doing them good; (knowing the prophane to be much worse than they) and meeting with too few religious persons that were not too much pleased with such *invectives*. So that his speaking so much evil of Episcopacy, Church-orders, and Liturgy, was done by designe to gratify the contentious spirit of the Religious party; that were so well pleased with such *invectives*; not, that there was any cause or ground for the same. And therefore tells us 2 part. *Defen.* p. 19. Tell me, Reader, whether this be not true? That if I had called the Bishops sacrilegious silencers of a faithful Ministry, Murderers of many hundred thousand souls, perjurious, proud, tyrannical, covetous, formal Hypocrites, malignant, haters of good men, &c. I might not very easily come off with many of these angry brethren, without any blame for want of meekness. As though he had not done all that, and much more, out of pretended knowledge, Conscience, and Judgment, in his 5. Disputations of Church-Government, which Dr Pierce observes to him, again and again, as before.

Why his  
repentance  
feigned.

And concerning which that the Reader may Understand, that this Repentance which seems to curry favour with the Bishops, published in 1671. is but feigned and a Mock-repentance, and but a playing fast and loose with God and men; let him but read the book which he printed in the year 1672. which he called the *Church-fold*,

and

and he will finde a justification of that Book, where all these bitter Invektives, are without the least retraction of the same, as you have it in p. 13. in these words.

He (viz. Mr Bagshaw) reciteth many words of my Disputations of Church-Government, and labourerth (whether by grosse ignorance or malice I know not, to perswade the Reader, that I retract or contradict them, and saith, We stand amazed you should so soon, and so much forget all that you have said.

This is not a single falshood but maketh up no small part of his book Reader, do but hear and Judge whether any thing except his amarauducation excuse such horrid deliberate intrueths? 1st I never retracted any of that book, setting aside the dedication [ which was this, viz. To his Highnesse Richard Lord Protector of the Common-Wealth of England Ireland and Scotland. ] So that, except the dedication, all is Justified, nor any thing in it retracted. 2ly That I do still professe, that I am of the same Judgment which that book expresseth. 3ly I have in the greatest audience told the Bishops that I stand to it; and provoked them to answer it [ which I presume was in the Savoy Conference. ] 4ly There is not a word of Contradiction to that book in my cure of Church-divisions, which he writes against. And am I not as like to understand my own writings, as this man is? In which book, viz. The Cure, writ 1640. (to give him his due) though he reviles the Separatists to the purpose, yet doth he not spare the Bishops whom he calls the Church-Tyrants, and those

that divide by violence, giving them many severe lashes throughout the book especially in the conclusion; and in the Epistle hath this patheticall expression. *How long, Lord, must thy Church and cause be in the hands of unexperienced furious fools* [ O meeknesse it self! was this writ to humour the invective itch of the separatists also? ] *who knows not what holinesse or healing is, but think that victory over mens bodies must be the cure of their souls, and that hurting them is the way to win their love! or that a Church is constituted of bodies alone, while souls are absent, or no parts! who will make themselves the rulers of thy flock, in despite of thee, and of thy cause, and servants, without thy call and approbation; esteeming and using their brethren as their foes; who scatter thy flocks on all the mountains, when Christ hath prayed, that they may be all one, &c.* And who, in his late writings, are we to understand by the Church-tyrants & Dogmatists but the Bishops? But further to confirm to you the insignificancy of that his repentance, take what Mr *Bagshaw* sayth of his repentance of this sort, which is most remarkable in his *Review*, p. 3. I am not ignorant that you now tell me you repent ( and you ought to thank me that I have been a means to bring you to it ) but as if you had long ago foreseen whither your temptations were like to hurry you, you have very seasonably forestalled and antedated, whatever ill use may be made of your present profession of repentance: Your words because they are very memorable I have taken pains *verbatim* to transcribe,



scribe, as I finde them in your holy Common-  
Wealth, p. 486, 487. I cannot see, say you, that I  
was mistaken in the main cause, nor dare I repent  
of it, nor forbear the same, if it were to do again  
in the same state of things; I should do all I could to  
prevent such a war: but if it could not be prevented,  
I must take the same side as then I did, and my judg-  
ment telleth me that if I should do otherwise, I should  
be guilty of treason and disloyaltie against the sove-  
reign power of the Land, and of perfidiousness to  
the Common-wealth, &c. And you conclude yet  
more remarkably, It were too great folly by following  
accidents that were then unknown for me to judge  
of the former cause: that which is calamitous in the  
Event, is not always sinful in the Enterprize;  
should the change of times make me forget that  
state that we were formerly in, and changing  
judgement, by loosing the sense of what then  
conduced to its information; this folly and for-  
getfulness would be the way to a sinful and  
not an obedient repentance. Thus (as I have, sayth  
Mr Bagshaw, already told you) like Caiphas,  
being high-priest for that year you prophesied.  
Sir 'tis possible (for what may not a little time,  
and change of success produce in so variable an  
understanding) that you may once more repent  
of your late repentance; for you have given in  
such evidence against your self, and layd down  
such convincing Arguments to make us believe  
your judgement is not yet altered (although  
your passion and interest is) that I must entreat  
every serious Reader to judge who hath dealt  
more candidly you or I, and from whom the  
greatest

greatest ingenuity is to be expected : For my part I cannot see but your repentance and Mr Leighs recantation may hereafter be bound up together in the same volume, and both be held of equal credit and Authority : Thus far Mr Bagshaw.

## SECT. II.

For and  
against  
non-con-  
formity.

**T**He next false accusation he accuseth me of is for saying *he was for and against Non conformity, viz. sometimes for Non-conformity ( in whose tents he hath seem'd to shelter himself in the storm, and with their Indulgence to come forth of his hole ) and yet at length so highly to disgrace the same.*

To which he saith p. 299. *Let him shew you, if he can, where or when I have changed my judgment, since 1640. Necessity having forc't me so long ago to study those controversies so hard as fixed me : and that I never heard any thing since, which had considerably altered me therein, which also being so visible in that my dispute of Liturgy and ceremonies written 1658. leaves no cloak for this mans calumnies.*

Made good  
against  
him.

Alas, what shall we say to such temerity and daring presumption ! First, to act and talk at such a rate for Non-conformity as the former Section evidenceth, and then to make such a shameful head against it, and yet to have the confidence thus to out-face the Sun, and with the Apostates in *Malachy's* time ask, *Wherein ? Mal. 3.8.13.* What, write, and fight, and contend so furiously for Non-conformity, and Non-conformists,

mists, as he hath done; and not only to run into that conformity he hath so spew'd upon, but so to load it with all manner of reproach, as the worst of sins which pulls down the greatest of Judgments; but to pour out so much scorn and contempt, upon all the Conscientious in the 3. Nations, whether *Independents, Presbyterians, Anabaptists*, who separate from *Parish-Assemblies* and worship, and keep not pace with him in his retreat, as peevish, ignorant, self-conceited persons, pulling down Judgements upon their heads. But whither will not a man, left to himself, run? And yet to say, you disgrace no Non-conformity but such as mine, who am as he saith such a Non-conformist to truth, Christian Duty, and common honesty. But since he reproches the whole Interest, and is so set in the seat of the scorner, I may not wonder to have my share; only this I shall say, it will be the Reader's part to judge betwixt Mr *Baxter* and my self, who is the most Non-conformist herein, he or I: with whom I leave it.

But saith Mr *B.* *what doth he mean by shelving my self in the storm in their tents, and coming out of my hole with them; I cannot imagine what, unlesse sense and truth at once forsook him.*

That truth and sence were both with me therein, is easily demonstrated to those that have not quit both; for, doth not he know that in his seeming to take up the Crosse with them, in becoming their advocate under those costly circumstances at the *Savoy*, being first silenced as he tells us, preaching in private holes or conventicles,

venticles, persecuted, imprisoned, disgraced, that he hereby seemed to cast in his lot amongst them, and was willing to share of what protection Gods promise and providence might afford such a state; and which, if we can believe his word, has not only Tent, or sanctuary, but Tower, shelter, and protection in it, as *Isay. 8. 12. 13. 14. Ezek. 11. 16. Pro. 18. 20. Rev. 3. 10.* The sense and truth of which word however Mr B. hath not understood; yet others, through grace, have experienced, and can seal to, in the storm that has been upon us.

And, That, from his preaching in holies or private Conventicles in houses, he came forth with the Non-conformists, to publick Preaching and Lectures, who can deny it? But to this he must say something, when his hand was in, be it right or wrong, whilst he takes the liberty to say almost any thing, *viz. what hole was it, that I came out of with their Indulgence? are such men as this, vindicators of God's truth and the Christian world, that pour out untruths at such a rate, in despite of the most publick notoriety of fact; And whereof I say again, let all the world judge; witnesse Shooe-lane, Pell-mell Meeting-place, and Glasse-house-Lecture, &c.*

### SECT. III.

For and  
against Ar-  
minianism

The next charge he gives me of injustice to his writings, is, for affirming him to have been sometime a friend to Calvin and then a greater to Arminius. To which he saith p. 301. *Did he tell the Reader, where, by one I did contradict the other?*

As

As though *Arminianism* doth not contradict *Calvinism*, but hath only a difference in sound of words, and not in sense, as our great *Cassius* is pleased now to tell us concerning this controversy, as well as the Popish doctrines, that have caused so much contention for many hundred years: having found out the new way of reconciling Christ and Antichrist that was never yet discovered. But concerning the nature of those controversies, it is not at all my work to ingage in at this time (which are substantially done by many, notwithstanding his dreames, and are like to be done by more, with shame enotigh to his rash erroneous and giddy undertaking;) my work being only to shew, that he was a man given to change almost in every thing, and amongst the rest in these controverted points amongst Protestants. And, to make that good, he has in his *Cath. Theol.* in his Preface, sufficiently acknowledged the same; so that we need say no more thereto.

Then further, in a quibbling way, to shew what a wordy Doctor he is; See (saith he) *the misery of a Sectarian spirit, that taketh it to be a contradiction, to be a friend to Calvin and Arminius both? he would, as this inferreth, take it ill, to be thought a friend to Anabaptists and Padobaptists, &c. p. 302.* as though I spoke of his friendship to the person of Calvin and Arminius, dead so long before he was born, especially the former; and not, their doctrines only.



## SECT. IV.

For and  
against  
the Parlia-  
ment.

The next thing he quarrels me for, is, for affirming that he was sometimes a great defender of the Parliament, and their cause; and then none more ready to renounce the same, and be-trayor them for their pains.

To which he saith, Was there never but one Parliament and one cause, running the changes of Rump, little Parliament, Protectors, &c?

Made good

Ans<sup>r</sup>. It is enough that he hath so contradicted himself in that Parliament cause, which he owned, stated and 4 years fought for, and which when he or any body in his behalf shall presume to deny, I am sufficiently prepared to make good, and to that degree, that will make the Readers ears to tingle, especially in that part, for which he hath so much betrayor d them, and would be thought to be so innocent. But a word to the wise, is enough.

---

SECT.

## SECT. V.

The next thing he calls me to account for, is, *For and against Tradition.*  
 for affirming *that he is sometimes a great opposer of Tradition, and anon a great defender thereof.*

To which he saith, *That if I take Tradition equivocally I do calumniate by Equivocation; but, if [by thereof] I mean [the same Tradition] my falshood hath no Cloak of an Equivocation. Bidding me prove what I say, by any words of his. And further saith, Did I write a Book to prove the Tradition of Adult Baptism from Christs time to ours, and when I have done renounce and scorn it? calling upon the Reader to see how I value my own work.*

To which I answer (and to the last first) : I say, I mention not Tradition of any humane Authority, to prove Adult Baptism of which there is no need, being so undeniably done by Scripture Authority, upon which we only lay weight for probation; which I have again and again told you in the treatise. But because there hath been so much stress laid upon it by the *Pedobaptists*, I have endeavoured out of their own Books, and from the very Authorities themselves have urged, proved the contrary to what they have affirmed; and, which is *Argumentum ad hominem*, and good against themselves, making it good from their own Prophets, that Adult Baptism by humane Authority is confirmed in every age; and that there is no good Authority out of primitive antiquity for Infants-Baptism. But withall we affirm,

Tradition and Aniquity urged by me not for probation but illustration.

firm, that it is only Scripture-evidence, not Tradition, that can authorize any ordinance of Christ. Therefore Mr B. mistakes himself in saying that I do renounce and scorne it, and undervalue my own work; which by no means I do, because I say, as a testimony of his instability, that he is sometimes for, and sometimes against Tradition, and do illustrate the truth of believers, and detect the error of Infants-Baptism thereby; which yet stands firm and good for the end I brought it, as much as if I should endeavour to convince a Turk of his mistake out of his own Alcoran and a Jew out of their Talmud, and yet believe neither to be of much force, for the confirmation of a Scripture-verity to a Christian.

But in the next place, as to the first; I doubt not to make it good against Mr B. from his own words, viz. That he has affirmed the same Tradition that he has before denied, and for which I might give him several Instances, but shall crave leave to do it, especially from one of a latter date it being freshest in memory, and of greatest remark; viz. That about his asserting the Creed to be writ by the Apostles 12 years before any book of the new Testament was writ advancing thereby Tradition above the Scripture and denying its sufficiency so much in contradiction to what himself had formerly written.

Therefore in the first place I shall shew you how Mr B. hath opposed Tradition in general as held by the papist and what in particular, respecting the Tradition about the Creed as po-

pish also: And then what in opposition to both he hath also affirmed,

First, as to his opposing of Tradition, reade M.B. a great opposer of Tradition. his *Saints Rest*, p. 235. where he tells us, That the Papists sinfully plead Tradition against the sufficiency of scripture. And in his *Key for Catholicks*, p. 93. That it is in our eyes an abominable impiety for you to equal your Traditions with the holy Scripture till you have enumerated and proved them; And it makes us the more to suspect your Traditions, when we perceive that they or their Patrons have such an Enmity to the holy Scripture, that they cannot be rightly defended, without casting some reproach upon the Scripture: But this we do not much wonder at, for it is no new thing with the applauders of Tradition.

And again in his *Right Method*, p. 225. That it was the Devil that opened a gap for humane additions [or Traditions] at which he might afterwards bring in more at his pleasure.

And in his *Key for Catholicks* p. 454. Scripture (sayth he) is the Test of Christianity, and must shew us sound in the faith; though the Church may shew us peaceable; therefore to seek for unity, verity, or felicity, by the loss or destruction of sanctity, Religion or charity, is really to renounce, oppose and lose them, viz. Sanctity, Religion, Charity.

And Secondly, as to the Tradition about the Creed, being writ by the Apostles themselves, and of the dangerous consequence of such a Tenet, take what largely he hath sayd in opposition to one Mr *Aswell*, who maintained that the Creed was written by the Apostles before the  
P Scripture,

M.B. opposeth the Tradition about the Creed.

Scripture, and to be received as the Scripture by the Traditions of the Fathers and Ancients with whom it was left for us, In his *Appendix to his 2d Edition of the Reformed Pastor*, where he tells him, *That he thereby advanced the Creed above the Scripture, and with contempt spit in the face of the Scripture, Because as he tells him it cannot be proved by Scripture or Antiquity that it was writ by them but much to the contrary.* And then gives these following substantial Arguments why the Creed in that form of words now delivered to us, could not be written by the Apostles, before the Scripture was written.

First, because there is no proof tendered thereof by the affirmers of it.

Secondly, because the Fathers in the first ages do give us the Creed in other words, not one of them giving us this form for above 300. years after Christ: Ignatius, Iræneus, Origen, Tertullian, write the Churches faith, but none of them in this form; So that it would make a man shake his head (saith Mr B.) to read such kind of proofs as Mr Ashwel offers, which only serve to disprove the thing heaping up forms to prove the Apostles used this Form.

Thirdly, because (saith he) I finde so many clauses now in this form, and for our better Information mentions them out of Bishop Usher, viz. [maker of heaven and earth] was a new addition not in the Ancient Copies. 2dly, [conceived] is added, the old form is, *born of the holy Ghost*. 3dly The word [Dead] is added. 4ly [Descended into hell] is added. 5ly The name of [God Almighty]



mighty] to the Article of Christ sitting at the right hand of God. 6. [Catholick] is added to holy Church. 7. [Communion of Saints] is added. And 8. [life everlasting] is added. All which he tells Mr Ashwel, are a considerable part of so short a Form, and which additions he sayth, (as Bishop Usher observes) were made not at once, but as heresyes sprung up at several times.

Fourthly, That the Nicen Creed was as confidently and more antiently called the Apostles Creed, and sayd to be delivered from the Apostles, (as he sayth Bish. Usher tells us in his *Dissert. de Symbol.* p. 16.) And therefore that we owe it no more reverence as to the Apostles, than to the Jerusalem, or Nicen Creed, and that the Nicen was the more common Creed.

Fifthly, From the uncertainty and impossibility to know this by Tradition, that if it should be, as Mr. Ashwel sayth, That the truth of the Apostolicalness of this Creed, and exposition of Scripture also, was to be made out to us by Tradition from the writings of the Church and ancient Fathers, Mr B. pathetically thus expresseth himself: *Oh that I knew where to finde the Church that could give me the sense of all Gods Oracles by this undoubted Tradition as from the Apostles themselves; or that I knew the name or characters of those Fathers that had this Depositum the sense of the Scriptures by Tradition from the Apostles; and where I may finde it left to us. Is it each Father individually? or is it the greater Number together? And how shall we take their vote, and know which of them to account a Father, and which not: surely when I*

reade them telling us no more the sense of those Oracles and so often erring and disagreeing, I cannot believe their memories were all so good as to deliver down from father to son an Exposition upon the Bible without writing: And if ever any of them had such a voluminous commentary in his brain from the bands of the Apostles, which was not thought meet to be given in writing, the issue by this time may convince us that either it was intended only for themselves, or else that indeed such a world of matter would have been surely better kept then this Tradition hath kept it. For I think most of us love our fleshly ease so well that if we knew where the book or the Church were that would give us such a certain Exposition of Scripture as from the Apostles, we would be glad of it, not only to the quieting of our minds, but also for the sparing our time and labour we bestow in our study?

Concluding that Mr Ashwels discourses ( and many of his train ) were self-conceited, dry and raw, and therefore tells him, he matters not what some of those good men over their Pots do learnedly reproach them for these things: Insinuating by this smart reflection, that he, Mr Ashwel and his companions might be good fellows as well as ignorant persons; And to which we may add what Mr Perkins sayth upon the Creed, p. 121. for the better information of any that desire to be established in this truth: viz. It was called the Apostles Creed because it was afterwards for substance taken out of their writings, not that they were the penners of it ( conferring besides the matter, the stile and frame of words as we have them

now,

now set down, as Ruffinus would have it in Symbol. ad Hierom. &c.) And that because, first there are in this Creed words and phrases, which are not found in the writings of the Apostles, and namely [that he descended into hell] in which if we in a Protestant sence would understand the Grave, it is a tautology, that being mentioned before, Dead and buried, and [Catholick Church] which began to be in use when the Churches were dispersed into all quarters of the earth, as, saith he, Pacianus Ep. informeth us: 2dly, if matter and words had been from the Apostles, why is not the Creed, canonical Scripture, as well as any other writings. So Mr Perkins.

Further, I shall now shew you what M. B. hath said in contradiction hereto. Therefore know, that notwithstanding all this unanswered reason, either by himself or any body else, he so far goes over to Mr. Ashwell the person he so judiciously opposeth herein, that in the *Glass-house Lecture* as famously known, he did declare, that he was of the opinion, that the Creed was written by the Apostles before the Scriptures of the New Testament were written, yea 12 years before any book thereof was written by any of the Apostles. And as being no Enemy to repentance, did thereby declare his repentance, for opposing that learned man Mr. Ashwell in the *Appendix to the Reformed Pastor*: and which was the substance of what then was said as near as I could gather from any that then heard him, whereat many being offended and the Town ringing of such strange doctrine, he to mend the matter has been

M. B. a  
pleader for  
Tradition  
especially  
that of the  
Creed

pleased in his *Cath. Theol.* in the Preface, thus to express himself, viz. *As Christ himself was the Author of the Baptismal Creed and Covenant, so the Apostles were the Authors of that exposition which they then used, and taught the Church to use; And they did that by the holy Ghost as much as their induing of the Scripture (which is nothing else, as he affirms, but the explication of the 3. Baptismal Articles; ) and to be the summary and symbol of Christian belief; 12. years before we had any book of the New-Testament, and above 66. years before we had them all: And this of Gods own making which was ever agreed on; when though he truly before tells you (and which also is confirmed by the Magdeburg. Cent. 1. l. 2. ch. 4. p. 66 ) that the 3 first ages knew no such thing as the Apostles Creed ) when many books of the New-Testament were not agreed on, whereas the whole Canon of the New-Testament ( as you will hear hereafter ) was fully agreed to, in the 2d and 3d Centurys. And therefore Mr. B. tells us, that those who deny the sufficiency of this Test and Symbol ( made by Christ and his Spirit ) to its proper use, to be the Symbol of such as, in Love and Communion we are viz. now at this day, to take for Christians, do subvert the sum of Christs Gospel and Law, and do worse than they that do add to or alter the lesser parts of the Word of God; And further in his 2d Preface, p. 19. It is to me a certainty that the Apostles made and used a Creed for sense and substance as the very summary and Test of Christianity long before any Book of the New-Testament was written ( about 12. years, and at*

most  
r. p.

most 66. before the whole). And it is certain by Church-history that (though some variety of little words was used, yet) this same Creed for substance (except the 2 or 3. clauses mentioned by Usner and Vossius) was commonly used at Baptism from the days of the Apostles. And it is certain, that if the Apostles did take this course so many years before they wrote any of the New Testament, they did this (as well as that) by the holy Ghost: and so that the holy-Ghost seconding Christs own Baptismal Law, or Instituted test, did make the Creed to be the summary of the Christian belief, twelve-years before we had any Book of the New-Testament, and about 66. as is said before we had them all: And then it will appear what is Gods appointed Test of Christianity, Communion, and Special love.

And in p. 287. Giving an account what sins (in his apprehension) some Protestants have run into in their opposition to Popery, tells us in the 2d. place, that they have wronged the Church by undervaluing the Tradition of the Creed and the Essentials of Christianity, by many means besides the Scriptures. Then goes on in his Preface, all which considered, though I think it is the truth which I long ago wrote against a Treatise of a learned man (Mr. Ashwell) in the Appendix to the 2d. Edition of my Reformed Pastor, yet I publish my repentance that ever I wrote it, as fearing lest it occasioned the turning of mens minds from this great truth, which he and I agreed in, and which I find few consider, as it deserveth. Thus far Mr. B. for the Tradition of the Creed.

Now may it not be well left without a Com-



ment how notoriously Mr. B. hath contradicted himself herein: And whether by that advancing this peice of Tradition before and above the Scripture, he doth not ( in his own words to Mr. *Ashwell* ) with contempt spit in the face of the Scripture as so substantially confirmed by those 5 Arguments he gave in the case, and which he now tells you he thinks was the truth; yet again seeming to quit so much Reason of his own and others, and to fall in with so much of what he so severely judged to be the raw, dry, self-conceited notions of some ignorant reprochers, and, as he was pleased to call them, pot-companions, meaning as I suppose Mr. *Ashwell* for one, against whom he writ, and whom nevertheless he now owns to be a learned man; let who that can, reconcile such contradictions.

And lastly, is it not manifest, that what he affirms as to the precise time of its Fabrication, viz. 12. years before any book of the New Testament was written, if we may give credit to that which goes for authentick story, is fabulous and ridiculous: For *Paraus*, *Proam. in Math. Hen. Alsted. præogn. Theol. l.2. c. 103.* out of *Eusebius* and *Theophylact.* inform us; That *Matthew's Gospel* was writ the 9th. year after Christs ascension: And *Baronius* also tells us, as *Spondanus* p. 46. anno. 41. In this same year S. Matthew the Apostle ( as *Eusebius* in his Chronicle informs, ) was the first that wrote the Gospel; so that, this being true, that the Gospel of *Matthew* was written the one and fortieth year after Christs Nativity, or the 9th. year after his Ascension, as antiquity informeth,

informeth, and learned men, both amongst Protestants and Papists, agree : And the Creed as Mr. *Baxter* now tells us was written 12. years before any Book of the New-Testament was written, then it must be at least 3, or 4. years before Christ dyed : If so, how will it correspond with that part of it *viz. suffered under Pontius Pilate, was Crucified, dead and buried, he descended into Hell, the third day he rose again from the dead, &c.* Therefore is it not meet, that he help us in this difficulty also, and give us something besides his own word to prove this Tradition, as well as the precise time mentioned by him; and how this seeming contradiction is to be reconciled, since we are to receive it with equal Authority, if not greater than the Scripture it self. Otherwise that he will give us leave in his own words to conclude, It is abominable impiety thus to equal Traditions with the holy Scriptures, and no other than the Devils Gap, to bring in what more additions he please at pleasure.

---

S E C T.

## S E C T. VI.

**T**He next piece of injustice he accuseth me of, is, for saying, 'That he hath sometimes been a violent Impugner of Popery, and yet at last who hath spoken more in favour of it ?

To which he saith, *Here again, if by [Popery] and [it] you mean the same thing, you hold on the same course: prove it true and take the honour of once writing a true accusation. I have not hid my Judgment about Popery, having written about 7. or 8. Books against it, in about 20 years time, by which you may see in comparing them whether I changed my judgment: If you cannot, refuse not to blush, &c. Concluding, that tears are fitter than Ink for such fearless, rash, continued, visible falsehoods to be deliberately published to the World as truths by one that calls himself a man, and a Christian.*

M. B. a-  
gainst Po-  
perry.

*Answer.* That Mr. B. hath written several books against Popery is fully owned, and therefore I say [sometimes a violent impugner of Popery;] But it follows not but he as well as many learned Protestants that have written against Popery while so, and afterwards turn'd Papists, may write for it also. Nay while they profess to be Protestants, may also plead for Popery. For doth not Mr. B. accuse Grotius, Dr. Taylor, Broomhall, and others of the Episcopal party who write against Popery, to be *Papists*, though they professed *Protestantism*? And upon which you have Dr. Pierce in his *New Discoverer*. p.

170. Telling Mr B. thus, viz. Though you have writ against the Papists a great deal more than enough, yet that is no more than a Blindition, to escape the rigour of the Law: How could you bold a sequestration, if you did not act the Presbyterian? Dr. Taylor writ against Papists, and yet you know what you have call'd Him, Dr. Hammond, Mr Thorndik, &c. have writ against Papists, but you know what they are for defending Grotius.

In the next place, it is therefore my part to M.B. for shew that he that hath writ so much against Popery. Popery, hath also writ much for it. And that not only for the doctrine of Popery, but for much of their Discipline also.

First, for their Doctrine, I gave you some For many account, in the Treat. p. 379. out of his book of the Popish Doctrines. call'd the Full and easie satisfaction, viz. And as to Popery I have certainly found that the cross-interest and passions of Disputers have made us (though really too far distant) to seem commonly about many Doctrinalls more distant than indeed we are, &c. I mean in the points of fore-knowledge, predestination, providence, pre-determination, concurrence, Original sin, free-will, universal redemption, sufficient grace, the nature of faith, justification, sanctification, merit of good works, certainty of justification, Salvation, and perseverance, imputation of righteousness, &c. And for his knowing this to be true, (he saith) he is censur'd to be too favourable to the Papists, &c. And who (think you) that deserved not to be censur'd for a Papist, did ever affirm so much before,

fore, viz. That the difference between the Papist and Protestant in these great fundamental Doctrines of the Gospel are but seeming not real differences? What no real difference about Popish merit and works of supererogation? nor any real difference respecting justification by works, as the *Council of Trent* held it, &c. Then surely we may suppose that *Paul* and the *Galatians* were nearer agreed than he was aware of, though he charged them to hold another Gospel; in maintaining the same things with the Papists. And withal it must not be forgotten, that Mr B. in the same Book p. 72. tells us, *That the Doctrine of the Papists is not only contrary to many express texts of holy Scripture but also contrary to its self.* Whereby we must understand that the Protestants Doctrine is also contrary to express Scripture and it self also; or else in his usual method he doth contradict himself, in affirming that there is no more difference betwixt them in Doctrinals; and it must be remembered, at another time he is pleased to tell us, *That their serving God to merit heaven, and doing works of supererogation, are of the Devil, as you have it in his book call'd The right method, &c. p. 255.* So that it seems there was more than a seeming difference then suppos'd about works and merit betwixt us and the Papist, or else the Protestant is supposed to comply with the Devils designe herein also. But to put the matter out of doubt in his late Folio book called his *Cath. Theology*, he doth wholly cast the scale upon the Papists side, making the Protestant the Heretick and Schismatick,



sick, and they the Orthodox Christians in these points. His own words p. 249. are these that follow, and which were so surprising to me that I would scarce believe my own eyes when I read them, viz. *And hereby what an honour is done to Popery and what a dishonour to the Reformed Churches when it shall be concluded that all the Churches heretofore even next after the age of the Apostles, and almost all the present Churches, were and are against the Doctrine of the Protestants and on the Papists side; And yet how many do us this injury and the Romish Church this honour, about the nature of justifying faith, and its office to justification, and about the nature of Justification itself, and imputation of righteousness, and free-will, and mans works and merits, and about assurance of salvation, and perseverance; how many do call that Popery which the whole current of Greek and Latine Fathers do assert, and all the ancient Churches owned, and most of all the present Churches in the World. And those that call all forms of Prayer Popery, or the English Liturgy at least [as Mr B. himself had done before] when almost all the Christian World have forms, and most such as are worse. Do but tell men that the Christian World is on the side that they oppose and against their way [though the Christian world owns the Popes head-ship which he opposes;] And therefore what a crime of Infamy it is to be taken for a separatist from the universal Church, and in Doctrines and forms of Worship, not only to avoid them as antichristian, but to persuade men we are not of the same Body, and so dishonour a sinful dishonourable*

M.B's severe reflections upon the Protestants doctrine.

dishonourable separation. And to entcrease *Athiesm*,  
*Idolatry* and *prophaness* amongst us, while zeal a-  
 gainst truth and reproaches of sound Doctrine  
 [ viz. such as the *Papists* hold therein ] do make  
 men think that *Christ's Religion* is nothing but  
 proud humour & self-conceit, whilst they see us bold-  
 ly condemn almost all the world except our selves;  
 they will think that so few as we deserve not to be  
 excepted, [ viz. from condemnation ] occasion-  
 ing all the *Papists* plots and cruelties at home and a-  
 broad, not using us as men, because we use not them  
 as Christians; And which he compares to the dota-  
 ges of *Munster*, which, he saith, was as a grave-  
 stone upon the Sepulcher which hindred the reviving  
 of the *Anabaptists* cause, &c: And if this be not  
 to the purpose I know not what is: Yet this is  
 the man that (though he at this rate contemns  
 the Protestant Doctrine ) undertakes so high-  
 ly to justify the 39. Articles of the Church  
 of *England*, engaging to make it appear, that  
 they have been successively held by the Church  
 from the beginning. *Key for Catholicks* Pref. p. 8.  
 If so, then these popish tenets about works,  
 merit, free-will, justification, &c. so positively  
 there condemn'd in so many of those Articles,  
 viz. Original sin, 9. Free-will, 10. Justification,  
 11. Works, 12. Works before justification, 13.  
 Works of super-erogation, 14. Predestination  
 and Election, 17. were not the opinion of the  
 primitive Churches successively since, as he now  
 in contradiction hereto affirms.

For and a-  
 gainst the  
 39. Arti-  
 cles.

And also in his *Grobian Religion*, Sect. 12. ( as  
 Bishop *Bramhal* in his *Vindication*, p. 41. ) Mr

B.

B. having charged the new Episcopal Divines to be Papists for favouring the *Grobian* way, tells us, *That the old sort of Episcopal Divines that received the publick Doctrine of the Nation contained in the 39. Articles, Homilies, &c. I wholly acquitted from my Jealousies of this compliance.*

So that if signing and consenting to those Articles and Homilies must acquit from Popery, which undoubtedly in these points they fully do, as Dr. Tully in his 3d Chap. p. 20. &c. manifests; then, by Mr B's renouncing these doctrines so fully there asserted, proclaims himself a Papist and one abounding in contradictions.

The Bishop further tells us, p. 34. *That he charges the new Episcopal Divines to bend the course of their writings to make the Roman Church honourable, and to vindicate them from Antichristianism, and to make the Reformed Churches odious.* And what is this but for himself to do the same thing under worse circumstances? Whereupon the Bishop tells him; *That he knows no man who honours the Church of Rome more than himself.*

How notorious a Papist Mr B. is herein, Mr Crandon hath 20. years since discovered; in his book call'd, *M. Baxter's Aphorisms Exorcized*: who compares his Doctrine about Justification with the most Trentified-Jesuitized Papists, Chap. 16. p. 215. 2. para. And how much he exceeds many moderate Papists. Ch. 16. p. 223.

Dr. Owen, near 20. years since compares this his corrupt doctrine about justification with the *Socinian*; discovering what harmony there is be-

twixt

B. Brimkal  
accuseth  
M.B. of  
Popery.

So doth  
M. Crandon  
don.

twixt them, in his *Vindicia Evangelica*.

So doth Dr. Tully in his *Justificatio Paulina* a late piece, proves what a papist he is herein, p. 116.

So doth Dr. Pierce discovers that though Mr B. accuseth Grotius and the Episcopal Divines following him to be Papists, yet how much he exceeds them in popery, giving diverse Arguments why he judges him a Papist, and a great factor for Rome in his *Appendix*, Sect. 5. p. 170.

And most remarkable (for self-condemnation) is that passage in his *Catholick Key*, making Arminianisme the nest-Egg of Popery, and inveighing against the Episcopal party, as Papists, for the same: Which you may take in his own words as you finde them, p. 326. viz. *As for the new Episcopal party that followed Grotius and Arminius in Doctrine, and the Greek Church; and were for a reconciliation with Rome; the interest the Papists had among them, and influence they had on them or their proceedings is evident from what is said before; and much from the copious proofs produced by Mr Prin in his Canterbury's tryal. And for which he quotes a passage out of the Jesuites Letter mentioned by M. Prin, p. 89. which saith, as Mr B. tells us, for our better information. Now we have planted that soveraigne drugg, Arminianism, which we hope will purge the Protestants from their Heresies and it flourisheth and beareth fruit in due season: And thereupon tells us, That the papists did creep into the Church under the garb of conformable Arminians, is too well known. And it is no wonder that Dr. Baily, Dr. Groff, Dr. Vane, Hugh Cressy, and many*

A most remarkable instance.

many more of them did openly revolt when the game seem'd to be spoyl'd that was played under-board, it had been far less hurt to us I think if all the rest had been as open.

So that if this be true Doctrine thus providentially dropt from his own pen, what shall we conceive of his now being the declared follower of *Grotius* and *Arminius* and the Greek Churches in those Doctrines before-mentioned; (yea so much out-doing *Arminius* himself therein,) but that it is as he unfolds the mystery to introduce Popery. And what a mercy would it be wholly to get off his Monks hood, that under the shape of a zealous Presbyterian, he may do us no more mischief, but appear a papist in his colours.

But Mr B. will tell you he is no Papist, because he renounces the Popes supremacy as Universal Monarch, and his infallibility, for which however he is censured by the Protestants to favour them in Doctrine; yet is he much more displeasing to the Papists. *Because* (saith he) *I know that one man is naturally incapable of being the Monarch of the world.* In his *Ep.* to his *Full and easie satisfaction*: centuring herein his chiefest opposition against Popery, and by which he would not be thought to be a Papist.

But this is a covering too narrow for him, because he knows the French whom he owns to be so honourable a part of the Church of Christ (and all the world knows to be Papists) do go neer as far in renouncing the Popes Monarchical supremacy and infallibility as Mr. *Baxter*.



And our Ancestors in *England* when declared Papists went as far also, witness the *Acts and Stat. of Hen. 1. Hen. 2. K. John. Hen. 3. Ed. 1.* particularly in the *Stat. of the 25. Ed. 1.* against Provisors, and another *Stat. of Premunire in Ed. 3. and 16. of Ric. 2.* and renewed by *Hen. 16.* which you have at large treated of, in *Robert Lalers Case* the Popes Vicar-Generall in *Ireland*, who was there tryed and convicted upon the *Stat. 16 Ric. 2. Chap. 5.* by Sir *Jo. Davis* the then Atturney-General of *Ireland*, and is in his Reports, and printed lately by Sir *Jo. Petto* for our present information.

The late  
discovery  
M.B. hath  
made of  
himself  
in his  
Cath.  
Theol.

Lastly, another Argument demonstrating Mr B. to be a Papist, is from those strong and substantial Objections he brings against himself upon common voge, and his weak and inconsiderable returns he makes thereto, as you finde them in his last part of his *Cath. Theol.* in the 13. Conference; betwixt a Sectary & a peacemaker, 157, p. 286. He asks the Q. to himself in the name of the sectary, *are you not warping to Grotianism which you have written against?* And again p. 287. *You will follow Grotius at last:* A very proper Question, to neither of which doth he say any thing, which implies he is conscious thereof or fully intends the same; for why did he ask and not answer, the Question if he did not intend his Silence should fully declare his consent. And 2ly p. 298. He brings the Sectary telling him, *That he strives against God's judgment's, by which he hath oft-times disown'd Popery among us, and would make that less odious which God by wonders hath oft*  
call'd

*call'd us to abb.r.* A trembling consideration indeed and seasonably urged. But what doth he answer thereto. He grants that God hath oft marvellously preserved us from their attempts, but if you will use untruths against them, they will repay you two for one, whereof he gives several instances out of their popish Legendaries, of lying Prodigies befalling Protestants. Insinuating as though we bear up our selves by such lying fables against their Religion, as though by a series of divine and miraculous providence, God had not preserved this Nation from their diabolical attempts for above an 100 years last past.

3. Again p. 298. He brings in the Sectary further telling him, *That it is one of the Artifices of the Papists which you have learn'd when they would draw men to set light by the purity of Religion, and the worship of God, to cry up love and concord and peace instead of it, and so to tie all mens tongues and hands from resisting their wicked Church pollutions by the fear of Schism, or being uncharitable to the polluters.* And so you will draw men to indifferency in Religion on pretence of peace and charity. This is to the purpose in the Consciences of all. To which he thus lamely replies fully bespeaking his guilt, *viz. That we come up to the worst of Popery when we imitate the bloodiest men among them in our degree, by pleading for sacrifice against mercy, telling us, That they are cruel in keeping out and judging heresie and Schism, so when they or we grow wrathfully zealous against our Brethren on pretence of purity of faith or wor-*

*Crys up  
love and  
mercy a-  
gainst sa-  
crifice.*

ship, and to make a Religion which quencheth love, we know not what spirit we are of.

Insinuating that our separating from the Papists for bloody Idolaters under pretence of keeping faith and worship pure, was a breach of mercy, and a sinning against the law of Love, and contracting the guilt of their cruelty to our degree, in that (which he calls) cruel and unmerciful separation from them, and which is but agreeable to his former Doctrine you have heard to this purpose.

4. Again p:295. He brings the Sectary telling him this great truth, viz. *That God telleth us himself, that he is jealous about his worship, and hath in Scripture more severely executed his justice upon the corrupters of his worship, than almost any other crime.* A most remarkable observation. But how doth he avoid the force of it?

M B.  
seems to  
make false  
worship to  
consist in  
Idol and  
Image-  
worship  
only.

*It is true saith he, God is a jealous God no doubt against Idolatry, and to worship by an Image is to deny him to be God. That the Jews great temptation to the Idol tries of the Nations about them were to be oppugned by great severities of God, and no doubt but Moses Law was to be honoured by Gods severe executions on the breakers of it. But Christs preaching under the Gospel is to send men to learn what that meaneth, I will have mercy and not sacrifice. And when the woman of Samaria like our Sectaries did turn from the Doctrine of faith to the controversie of the times, Christ teacheth her to worship God in spirit and truth.*

As though God was not as severe under the Gospel for corrupting his worship as under the Law,

Law, & enjoyn'd not the keeping to institutions as well as to the Moral Law : and as though the popish abominations were not to be abandoned as Idolatrous worship that provokes the Lord, and pulls down Judgments ; and as though those that conscientiously pleade separation from them upon that account deserve to be esteemed Sectaries ? At another time he can tell us, *That false worship doth not only as Idolatry signifie the worshipping of a false God, or the Idolatrous worshipping of Images, but the worshipping of God by Doctrines and prayers that consist of falsehoods, or devising worship-ordinances, and falsely saying, they are the ordinances of God.* Deten. of Princ. of Love. p. 3. part 2.

5. Again p. 293. further records this great truth from the mouth of the Sectary, who tells him : *That all who revolt to P. pery begin with Questioning whether the Pope be Antichrist, and telling men of the Darkness of the book of the Revelation ; which reaches his case fully.*

To the former part of the Question he thus speaks in the foregoing words, viz. *That it is a dangerous and perverse way of reasoning a minus notis, which will let in almost any errors, from a dark text in the Revelation or Daniel, or from the supposition that the Pope is the Antichrist, and all Papists received the mark of the beast ; you gather conclusions against the notorious duties of Love and peace, which the light of Nature doth commend to all.* Though in his *Christian Directory*, p. 777. he tells us. *If by Antichrist be meant one that usurpeth the Office of a universal Vicar of Christ.*

and constitutive and governing head of the whole visible Church, and hereby layeth the ground of Schisms and contentions, and bloodshed in the world, and would rob Christ of all his members, who are not of the Popes Kingdom, and that formeth a multifarious Ministry for this service, and corrupteth much of the Doctrine worship and discipline of the Church; in this sense no doubt the Pope is Antichrist: And as to him discribed in the Apocalyps and Thessalonians, if the Pope be not he, he had ill luck to be so like him: And that Dr. Moores and Dr. Downhams and many others Expository arguments are such as I cannot answer.

2. Asserts the darkness of the Revelations.

Then proceeds as to the latter part about the Revelations, telling us to this purpose; that Peter speaks of many things hard to be understood, which the unlearned wrest as other Scriptures to their own destruction. And if the Revelations be not one of these hardest, I crave your Answer to these Questions.

First, why are five Expositors usually of 4 opinions in the expounding it? 2ly, why do none that judge it so easy, write one certain commentary which may assure, which of the former, if any one of them, was in the right? 3ly, Why did not Calvin expound it? 4. And if you take it to be so necessary as you pretend, tell me whether it was so necessary and so taken by all those Churches that for a long time received it not as Canonical Scripture, surely they were saved without believing it: Yet concludes, that Book is a mercy to the Church, and all should understand as much of it as they can.

But



But whether this be not a full confirmation of the Suspicion of his revolt to Popery, that not only speaks now so suspiciously about the Popes being the AntiChrist concerning which he had spoken so fully in his former book : And by telling us of the darknes of that book which so fully discovers it, and to that degree so, that as he formerly confest that if he be not he, he has ill luck to be so like him.

But first, as to the instance he gives of the darknes of the *Revelations* in discovering of these things from the different judgments of Expositors, I presume will be found to be his mistake, for however there may be great differences about the Mistical Numbers, the time of opening the seals, and powring out the Vialls, yet there are few of the Protestant Expositors, I think, I may say, not 4 in 5 but do agree, that the Pope is the Anti-Christ, the man of sin, the head of the false Church, or that Bloody-scarlet-Whore that corrups the Earth with the cup of her fornications, in whom is found the blood of the Saints, and the Martyrs of Jesus : And from whose filthy Church or state Gods people are commanded to separate, and not to partake of her sins, lest they share of her plagues. He confesses before that Dr. Moors, Dr. Downhams, and others Expository Arguments are so harmonious and cogent in this poynt, that he cannot answer ; Therefore it is no wonder that since with the Papists he gives way to doubtings about the Revelation or discovery of those Anti-Christian abominations in that Book, that he

comes to be so lax in the poynt of seperation from them.

A vile insinuation and dangerous assertion.

And 2ly, as to that other corrupt and *mischievous* insinuation viz. *That if that book be so necessary as we pretend* [as though it was not so in truth] then he would have us tell him, *whether it was so necessary and so taken by all those Churches, that for a long time received it not as Canonical Scripture; surely they were saved without believing it.* What can he or any Papist or Athiest say almost worse to bring that blessed book or any other part of Gods word into contempt, than to tell us that *the divine Authority thereof was long questioned by many of the Churches of Christ.*

Revelations vindicated.

But whether Mr. Baxter ought not severely to be reprov'd either of egregious ignorance or desperate folly in this rash and dangerous assertion. For either he knows who and when those Churches were, who so long rejected or not received this *book*, whose salvation he doubts not of, [though contrary to express Scripture in the case, whose names are to be blotted out of the book of life, and thrust out of the holy City, *Rev. 22. 18. 19.*] if he did why did he not mention to us who those Churches were, in what age, and in what Author we may finde them, are we to believe it upon our Dictators word? But if he has no good Author to justifie him therein, why then is he so impiquely daring to tell us such a Fable?

I have read the learned *disquisitions* of John Gerard and Beza upon the point: the first in his

loc.

loc. Com. de Sacr. Scrip. c. 10. Sec. 292. &c.  
 The other in his *Prolegom. in Apocal. Johan.* who  
 give an account from *Eusebius Erasmus* and o-  
 thers, of those who in any age made any Quest-  
 ions about this book, but finde no such thing of  
 the many Churches who so long a time denyed  
 the same. Gerard observes, that *Eusebius* in his  
 3d. book. c. 21. tells that some disallowed it, but  
 mentions none, and his 7. Book 24. c. tells us  
 from *Dyonys. Alex.* That some of old thought that  
 book to be writ by Cerinthus the Heretick and not  
 by the Apostle John, but mentions neither persons  
 nor Churches. Though *Dionysius* gives great testi-  
 mony to the Divine authority thereof. And that  
*Jerom* (as *Beza* and Gerard) in his *Epist. to*  
*Dard.* Tom. 4. f. 29. sayes, That many learned  
 men among the Greeks rejected it contrary to the  
 Latins, but mentions none by name.

To which both Gerard and Beza oppose the  
 learned men by name that declared their high  
 prize of that book and full owning thereof not  
 only amongst the Latines, as *Irenaeus, Damascen,*  
*Tertullian, Cyprian, Hillary, Ambrose, Gregori-*  
*us, &c.* but amongst the Greeks, as *Justin Mar-*  
*tyr, Origen, Clem. Alex. Dyon. Alex. Chry-*  
*ostom, Jerom, Basil,* and that *Epiphanius* to that  
 degree did assert it, that he judged they should  
 be rejected as Hereticks who refused it. And  
 that hereupon Gerard saith; that *Chytraeus* tells us,  
 in *Apoc. Vetustissimos Doctores qui temporibus Apo-*  
*stolorum vicini fuerunt, communi consensu hunc*  
*librum Johanni Apost. adscripsisse; That the most*  
*ancient Doctors nearest to the Apostles times testifie*  
*with*

with one consent that this book was writ by the Apostle John.

They also tell us, that *Athanasius* was said to leave it out of his Catalogue of the Canonical Books, and that the Council of *Laodicea* in the 39. Canon, where they mention the Canonical books, do not mention it, and that it is left out in the Apostles Canons. To which they say, as to that of *Athanasius*, the authority of it is questioned, and the rather because *Athanasius*, as *Gerard* observes in his *Synopsis*, writes, *Apocalypsin, à praeis patribus approbatam*; the *Apocalypse* was approved by the Ancient Fathers.

And as to the Council of *Laodicea's* leaving it out (which my friend Mr *Will's* calls their rejecting of it and then scoffingly asks me what will become of my *Theopolis*, writ upon part of that book, p. 28. *Vind.*) They observe it is only a not mentioning of it and not a rejecting of it. And to that one Greek Council so omitting it, they oppose the many Greek and Latine Fathers, who at that time subscribe to it, besides the express owning it had from the Council of *Ancymanus*. 3. Council of *Carthage*, 4. Council of *Toletan*, who do reckon it among the canonical Books in their Catalogues. And as to the Apostles Canons that they are spurious and supposititious.

This account I thought meet upon this occasion to give you from these learned men who writ in vindication of that Blessed book in opposition to this venomous detraction of it by our Antagonist, who it may be is able to give some other  
 cacount,

account, and prove to us out of some other Authors, that these men had not met with to prove and maintain, that so many Churches for so long time did not receive it as Canonical, and which if he produce not, let this be put amongst his *evil dealing with the Church and truth of God*. But in the mean time I presume it cannot be denyed, but that he has given a grant to the Sectaries Argument in his objection, *viz.* That if not to own, or to question whether the Pope be Antichrist, and to tell men of the darkness of the Book of the Revelation, evidenceth a man to be revolted to Popery, that Mr B. hereby hath given a substantial testimony that he is one of those.

6. Again, p. 296. *But it is a time when Popery is striving to rise again, and how unseasonably would you abate mens Zeal against it? And what more certain? or could be more reasonably urg'd? But how doth he answer it?*

To this he replies thus, *No more then he was against his Lawyers zeal who grew hoarse with senseless bawling for him, saying, I am glad he has lost his voyce, or else I might have lost my cause; I am so much against Popery that I wish it a wiser and abler Adversary [viz. such as himself] then self conceited unstudied zealors [For such indeed have the Papists called all our Apocaliptical men who have been the most zealous opposers of them] who would make people believe that it consisteth in some good or indifferent things [for so it seems Popish abominations must be called] as in some Doctrines [viz. merit, and works super-*

M.B. joins with scorners in deriding Gods people for their faithfulness.

*erogation,*



erogation, &c. ] *forms of Government.* [ viz. In their superstitious vain inventions ] *which others can see no harm in* [ viz. such whose eyes are blinded being drunk with the whores cup ; ] comparing such zealots *to men raving in their sleep against they know not what.* But alas ! whether will not men left to themselves run !

M. B.

mocks on.

7. Again, p. 287. brings in the Sectary [ to tell him *Is it not safest to get far enough from Anti-christ and Popery* [ yes sure enough : ] *your study is to teach men how near they may come to sin without sin, and how to dance about the brink of hell* [ nothing more certain, but take heed God will not be mocked ; ] *for my part I will be one of them : that shall come out of Babilon , and partake not of her sins, nor touch the unclean thing, and that keep there garments undefiled ;* [ As though Christ has not commanded all this, and he deserves the name of Sectary that yields conscientious obedience thereto. ] *And not one like you that is grown luke-warm by being over-fond of nni-ty and peace :* [ And is not this the judgment, to have eyes and see not , and ears and hear not , And to know the judgment of God against such things and yet to do the same , and to scoff at and mock their faithful reprovers and Monitors,

M. B's

self-judg-  
ings

8. Again, *Would you perswade us to a union with Anti-christ and to live in love and concord with the members of the Devil,* [ so Dr. Moor and Dr. Downham and others tell him, whilst he designs to reconcile us to those whorish abominations and Romish false worships, and which are arguments he tells us he cannot answer ]. *Have*

you

*you no way to reconcile us to Rome but by pleading for love and peace? [no sure, that is the most effectuall way, no Jesuite can do it more subtilly]. Must we not contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the Saints- [yes sure, and that those that betray, and deny it, are like to finde to their sorrow though they mock and call them sectaries that tells them so: ] And not to be lukewarm to the Doctrines of Jezabell, that seduceth the people of God to Idolatry: [mock on, the Lord will meet, and knows how to deal with such scorners. ]*

---

## S E C T. VII.

*A further Demonstration of Mr. B's. Defection to Popery, is the Detection of his 56. Superstitious or Popish Doctrines.*

**T**He next thing he upbraids me for, is the putting into my first Edition, a collection of certain of his positions out of his *Christian Directory*, which he is so far from acknowledging to be his mistakes, that most impudently, I had almost said impudently, he justifies and calls the contrary opinions thereto, the *sectaries 56. New Commandements, or the new Religion of his backbiters who calumniate him for holding the contrary.* Concerning which I shall give the Reader this following account, submitting it to Judgment, whether I have done Mr. B. any injurie herein.

It is very true that book of Mr. B's coming out,

out, just as I was concluding my Preface, and meeting with such strange Doctrines from a Protestant Pen, and some of them respecting the controversie treated on, did put a short abridgment of some of them in the Preface. In the recital whereof it must be supposed I either did him right or wrong: If I gave truly his sense, why dorth he complain for telling what he delivers to the world as truth? And if I injur'd him by any mis-representation which he and others have complain'd of, why hath it not been made appear?

It is true, he did in a Preface to his book, call'd the *Full and easie satisfaction*, insinuate, that I had wronged him herein, wherein I vindicated my self in my 2d Ed. answering his Preface, and to which he hath made no exception, only in this answer he hints at two, to which it is meet I give him some Reply: The first whereof is expressed in Mr B's *More Proof*, p. 313. viz. of the Question 49. p. 826. as cited by him, *The falshood of his inserting [in a Popish Countrey in their way of Baptizing] in that cited place which speak only of the Lutherans, I passe by as weary of answering such.*

M. B's mistake about  
Lutherans  
Baptism  
with  
Chrism.

To which I have already answered, but if he will take no notice of it, to what purpose should I mention any thing to him: The reason, as I have said, of my so saying in [*a Popish countrey in their way of baptizing*] was to rectify, as I supposed, Mr B's mistake, not finding that the Lutherans did use any such rite in their baptizing, as Chrisme and Exorcisme: Ist, because

none of their confessions of faith, either the *Marpurg, Smalkaldick Articles*, nor *Augustin Confession*, 2ly, Because their eminent Church writers, viz: *Illericus, Uviganus, Jndex, Faber* and *Osiander* renounce these rites as popish, ridiculous, and superstitious. 3dly. That some that have seen them Christen their children, have told me, they use no such custom, to none of which is he pleased to give any return, but satisfyes himself in a bare upraiding me again herewith, without answering my reasons, or justifying his assertions; but how ingenious such a course is may be submitted to consideration.

The 2d. mistake he mentions, p. 314. viz. *It M B's 1*  
*is but one of your tricks which you know not how to* *cavil on.*  
*forbear, to foist in [ peril of Law ]* p. 372. Ed. *we.ed.*  
 2. when I had not such a word or sence as *peril*: as  
 if you knew of no obligation there but from *peril*.

*Ans.* His words are these: *But where Law,*  
*scandal or great inconveniency forbids, he is not*  
*to make this profession openly, viz.* The party that  
 hath his child, baptized with those rites which  
 he repotes unlawful, ought to bear witness a-  
 gainst it, but in these cases not openly, which  
 made me say *peril of Law* because scandal and  
 inconveniency are joyn'd with Law, supposing,  
 if publick, witness were born, it might bring  
 inconveniency upon them by breaking the Law  
 that enjoyns it with a penalty, there being no o-  
 ther obligation but conscience or prudence; if  
 he or any body else can give a better sence let  
 them. But if these be not pittiful cavils instead  
 of just exceptions let all men judg.

But

But in the next place whether there was not some cause astonishingly to remark such Doctrine from a Protestant, and (one that hath been supposed) a Non-conformist pen, is in the next place to be considered. The first thing I mentioned from him was this, *viz.*

The sinfulness of baptizing a child with chrysm justified

*That it is lawful to offer ones childe to be baptized with Exorcism, Chrysm, milk, honey, &c. rather than not have it baptized, those ceremonies being so ancient, that their Original is not known, call'd by Epiphanius and others, the tradition and custome of the Universal Church, p. 826: which he is now so far from disowning, that he affirms for any to say the contrary, (viz. that it is unlawful so to do) that he ought to be esteemed an ignorant silly sectary for ridiculously saying, That it is sin for any man (supposing Infants-Baptism a duty) to offer his childe to be baptized where it will be done with the signe of the cross, or such ceremonies as the Lutherans use (which he has affirmed to be Chrysm & Exorcism, and which he should not have left out) though he profess his own dissent, and disallowance of those ceremonies, and though he cannot lawfully have it done better, but must have that or no Baptism at all.*

It is true: I own my self one of those silly Sectaries that holds it sinful and unlawful for a Protestant Pædobaptist so to baptize his childe for the following reasons:

First, because Mr *Hanmer* in his *Confirmation* a book so much recommended by Mr *Baxter*, doth upon such good grounds tell us, that Chrysm, and Exorcism, are as *Homius* tells



us so blasphemous and iddatrous; and such ex-  
 crements of Antichrist as Tilenus: such empty and  
 impious ceremonies as Ames; and such execrable  
 blasphemies, as Calvin informeth us: Yea Mr  
 Baxter himself besides this, tells us in his *Right  
 method*, however he has so forgot himself, p.  
 255. That *Chrysm*, viz. *Crossing with Oyle, salt,  
 spittle, and exorcisme, or conjuring out the devil,*  
*(as he tells us)* were the additions that the devil in-  
 vented and put into Gods worship; Therefore it  
 being such a blasphemous, idolatrous, filthy, ex-  
 ceptable and devilish thing, it will be some vindi-  
 cation to those that shall presume to call it sinful;  
 whatever our great dictator saith now to the  
 contrary.

Secondly, the Scripture is positive, that we  
 must not *do evil that good may come thereon*, but  
 rather avoid the supposed good than to contract  
 so great a guilt: For what popish Idolatrous a-  
 bomination may we not do upon this pretence?  
 May we not go to their Sacrament of the Altar  
 rather than want the communion, and thereby  
 partake of all the blasphemies of their Mass,  
 which we may confidently affirm is not less cor-  
 rupted than this of Baptism? Doth not this do-  
 ctrine of Mr B. reprove the folly of the old Chri-  
 stians that would rather die than put a little in-  
 cense into the Censer, or so much as give the least  
 consent that another should do it for them, and  
 how simple were so many in *Q. Mary's* time to  
 go to the fire when they might have saved their  
 skins with such compliances as these? And how  
 doth it reprove those *Waldenses* which as Mr B.

tells us of, from *Perin*, that rather than have their Children baptiz'd by their popish priests with their blasphemous additions, they refused to baptize them for some hundreds of years.

Thirdly, I judg it utterly sinful and unlawful to commit such abomination, for by the same reason we give way to own sinful addition in Gods worship, according to Mr B's wholesome rule before given us, we may introduce what the Devil shall make for us. And which to save our selves the labour and our Reader the trouble, may serve for an answer to all the rest of the Popish additions, and inventions that Antichrist has injoynd; and Mr B's Logick would hook us into conformity to, viz. the popish Cringes, Kneelings, Bowings, Homilies, Vowes, Apocrypha, Crucifixes, Images, blyness of daies, times, places, Utensills, persons, Fasts, Feasts, Anthems, Church-Musick, drawn forth by him to 42. And therefore if he please, let him tell the world as he desires, that I am one of those that judgeth it sinful to admit any of these things in Gods worship, without a rule and direction from himself, bespeaking our selves wise above what is written, and as Mr B. himself hath so well informed us already, as p. 32. will serve only to render Gods divine worship a humane thing, declare us exceeding proud in thinking our selves wiser than our maker and Redeemer in exalting our selves above him, by correcting his Laws and mending his work, and contract to our selves a great deal of guilt by sinfully adding to the thing God commands contrary (as he tells us) to Deut. 12. 32.

SECT.

## SECT. VIII.

*Mr B's Jesuitical Quarries about the Scripture answered; being a further Argument that he is Popishly affected.*

**A**S to what I said in my Preface about his Quarries of the Scripture, he seems to be much concerned, expressing himself thus, viz. *But yet we have not done with the high charges of his Preface.* 'Ob were not those 20. Quarries, in his 2d Admon. p. 142. so much against the self-evidencing Authority of the Scripture, in favour of Tradition, a bairous provocation, to say no more of them.

To which he saith, *It seems they were so to you, but really did you reade that book and the other to Mr Bagshaw, and yet not fear to follow him and out-do him in notorious untruths, after so full a conviction and warning as was given him, think of it, think on it, and again cry out; Bus alas! whereto will men run left to themselves!* And then for my better information and reproof, turns those 20. Quarries into Catagorical propositions, adding 4. more to them, now 24. in all, which he joyns to the 42. new Commandments before-mentioned, making them 56. in all: And which he tells me as he hath Jesuitically drest them, *If I and his revilers own them, so will not sober men.*

To which I think Mr. Bagshaws return to those Quarries may be a good answer, viz. *when you have satisfied me that you sinned not greatly in raising such mist and doubts, and when you have*

given me security that you will not ask any more of them, than he would then reply to them.

But if he would heve another answer in the mean time, I'll give it him from his own pen, as he may find it in his *Key for Catholicks*, p.200. ch. 31. Deter. 22. *Another of the Jesuits deceits is, by quarrelling with our Translations of the Bible and making the people believe that we have so corrupted it, that it is none of the word of God, and so they openly scorn it and deride it.*

*As to this point, though learned men can soon confute them, by vindicating the Text, as in the Original Languages, and then vindicating our Translation; yet the common Disputant need not put them and himself to so much trouble, if really they will but let the Law of Goel contain'd in the Scripture be the rule by which our difference shall be tryed and decided; we will cut short the rest of the controversy, and take it wholly together, and we will stand to the vulgar-Latine, which is it that themselves applaud; we are content that this should be the rule between us. Yea, rather than they shall shift off the unlearned by these tricks, we will admit of their own translation, which the Rhemists have (with little friendship to our cause) composed, only we must entreat them that their Commentaries and conceits be not taken with the text as part of the word of God. So that this quarrell is quickly at an end, the Scripture is so full against them, that no Translation that makes it not another thing can make it to be on their side. If he would have a fuller Answer to his 24. Qneries, he may reade Dr. Prideaux, Altingus, Amesius, Dr. Owen, Ferguson,*

Ferguson, John Gerard, &c. who have learnedly treated upon the subject, and fully answer'd all these sophistical and Jesuitical insinuations, whereby they would puzzle the weak, and bring contempt upon the Word of God, the better to make way for their abominable Traditions and Popish Inventions.

CHAP. III.

*Mr. Allen justly reprov'd for his Groundless Complaint, and Mr. B. for abetting the same.*

**M**r. Baxters 9th. Chapter ushers in what he calls Mr. Allens Vindication for a supposed injury done him by my self, in affirming, *That he and another were gone back to Infants-Baptism; which in their writings they had owned to be Will-worship and Idolatry:* Which Mr. Allen takes to be so unjust a thing, that he conceives himself engaged to tell the world thereof, having (as he saith) *not so much as mentioned either of those Expressions as said by me: (viz, Will-worship or Idolatry;)* Nor is he conscious (as he saith) to himself of ever being so absurd as once to think that (viz. Infants-Baptism) to be Idolatry, which I most untruly say he calls so, and that that cause is little beholding to such an advocate as thinks to reconcile men to it by abusing dissenters. But what cause he hath for this complaint, is now to be Examined.

It is true, I do remember that Mr. Allen did after my first Impression tell me in a Book-sellers



shop, that I had charged him to say what I could not make good, and that therefore he desired some publick satisfaction from me. To which I replyd as he may remember, that if I could not produce the very words, yer if I could shew him wherein he had expreit the sense of them, he had no cause of complaint; and no more Injury done him, then the holy Spirit hath done the Prophets, in telling us, that they say so, and so in several quotations out of them in the New Testament, when the sense only, and not the very words and syllables are there to be found; And that if I could make it appear that he had call'd *Infants-Baptism False-worship*, or *Kain-worship*, he had thereby called it *will-worship* or *Idolatri*, or else our Protestants, as he knew had much mistaken themselves in that their definition: which I had hoped might have satisfied him; but he told me that would not serve my turn; and therefore it seems hath betaken himself to this course (Ingaging Mr B. in his quarrel also) for better satisfaction: Therefore in the next place, we shall give you a brief account of the substance of what Mr Allen tells us in his Writings upon that subject, and then leave the Reader to judge where the injustice lyes, viz.

Mr. A's  
Argu-  
ments a-  
gainst In-  
fant-Bap-  
tism.

In that his book called *Baptismal abuses*, mentioned by me (in my *Treatise*; 1st Edition. p. 53. *post-script*) you will finde he expresseth himself very largely concernaing Infants-Baptism.

First, telling us, in the *Premonition*, or *Pre-face* to this propose, That it hath been a misera-  
ble

ble snare to millions of souls who have blessed themselves to be Christians, and in a salvage condition, thereby without faith and repentance, (viz. by that \*Christning) when no such thing.

2ly, That it hath been the root and off-spring of the National Churches, yea, of the Popeadome it self, and to that degree, that it is, sine qua non, that without which neither the one nor the other would have been.

3ly, That it is guilty of rending and tearing, and indeed dissolving the true Churches of Christ in the world.

4ly, That it is like to prove such leaven to the Congregational Churches, that it necessarily returns them in an age or two into National Churches again.

5ly, That it is such a Doctrine of Ungodlyness, such a root of bitterness, that it is the auer of all those that love and honour Jesus Christ, and the prosperity of his affairs, both in the Churches and in the world, (both which have suffered so deeply by it) to endeavour with all their might (in a Christian way) the extirpation of so evil a custom.

6ly, That it is such a vain Imagination in those that would found Infants Church-Membership under the Gospel, because such in the law, that they might as well affirm, that the Gospel ministration was carnal, weak, beggarly and unprofitable, because that of the Law was such: Heb. 7. 18. And that because the natural seed of Abraham, were then taken in, and the Ignorant and unbelievers, and persons guilty of morall pollutions, viz. Extortion, railing, covetousness, &c. were not

cast out, if they did but keep the ceremonial Law, which according to the Apostle, stood only in meats and drinks, and carnal Ordinances; Heb. 9. 9, 10. That therefore the Gospel Church might consist of such also; contrary to Gal. 3. 7. 26. 29. Rom. 9. 8. 1 Cor. 5. 2. and 15. 34.

2. In the  
Body of  
the Book.

And Secondly, in the body of the book further tells us;

1st. That such a practice of baptizing Infants was neither administered by John nor Christ, to p. 12. by diverse Arguments.

2ly, Nor could possibly answer any of the ends of Baptism Enumerating diverse, to p. 30.

3ly, How utterly disagreeable it was to the Evangelical administration though very agreeable to the Legal, to p. 38.

4ly, How dissonant that practise was to Reason and truth, to p. 50.

5ly, Therefore, truly and Rationally concludes, p. 64.

1st, That it was none of Gods Baptism; viz. of his ordering and appointing, but a device of mans own heart. Therefore 2ly, to be compared to Jeroboams feast: 1 Kings 12. 32. 33. who placed Priests in the high places, sacrificed to the calves that he had made in the moneth he devised of his own heart, [and which the Reader may take notice of, was no less then worshipping of devils, as the Spirit tells us, 2 Chron. 11. 15.] 3ly, A plant therefore as not of Gods planting to be rooted up, Math. 15. 13. 4ly, a vain-worship taught by the precepts of men; Math. 15. 9. [And in p. 68. of his Answer to Mr Goodwins 40. Queries,

with

writ at the same time, and upon the same Arguments. (And as in mine but one book joyn'd and bound together) that it ought therefore to be rejected as will-worship and the serving of God according to the precepts of men, Col. 2. 18. 23. Isa. 29. 13.] 5ly, That it was a meer nullity, because that was wanting in it which was essential to Baptism, viz. there being neither the right subject, nor true external form to be found in it; And that if matter and form be wanting, be it in Baptism or any thing else, there must needs be a nullity: For how is it possible to define Baptism or any thing else without matter and form. And that therefore they who build upon it, have nothing but Air and Vanity for their foundation. 6ly, That it is sinfull in Parents to order it, in Ministers to give it, and in the parties themselves afterwards, when they come to understanding, to own and stand by it. Proving amply, in his Answer to the Queries, bearing the same date, that it is as little to be made out by antiquity as Scripture, and the vain Imagination of those that go about to found it upon Analogy to Circumcision and the Jewish Church. And to be as much abandoned as any of the Antichristian superstitions; whereof this of Infants-Baptism is none of the least. Thus I have given you some slender brief account of what is largely and fully treated in above 200. pages in Quarto, worthy the serious perusall of any that doubt or desire their better Information therein: now all this being put together, what can be said worse of it, and more fully to prove what I affirm he charges upon it? And in the which we have also  
one

The charge  
justified.

one of the very terms he so positively denies, viz. *Will-worship*, and surely if we finde *Infants-baptism* to be charged with *Will-worship*, & *Vain-worship* to be a *nullity* and *Vanity*, we cannot miss of *Idolatry*: Our Protestant writers so fully agreeing, that not only the worship of false Gods is an *Idolatry* forbidden in the 2d. Commandment, but the worshipping of the true God in a false manner is *Idolatry* also. Not only as *Ainsworth* saith, (upon it) *forbidding all feigned false Gods, but all feigned service of the true God*, The word *Elilim*, *Idols*, signifying *nothing*, *Lyes*, *Vanity*, and Mr. *Allen* calling *Infants-Baptism* a *Nullity*, *Air*, *Vanity*, what doth he otherwise call it in plain English, but an *Idol*? And if as he tells us, it be the foundation of the Antichristian *Idolatrous Church* and the *sinew* of the *Idolatrous Popedom* it self; and to be compared to *Jeroboams feast*, surely he makes it *Idolatry* not of the least magnitude? *Wilson* in his *Theatrum* tells us, as one definition of *Idolatry*; that it is an *humane Invention*, thrust into *Divine service*; and Mr. *B.* in his *Defence of the Principles of Love*, par. 2. p. 3. tells us to this purpose, that *false worship or Idolatry* is either the worship of the false God, or the true God falsely, & which is done by devising worship Ordinances, and falsely saying they are the Ordinances of God, &c. as M. *A.* has so largely proved concerning *Infants-baptism*: *Idolatry* being also, as the Scripture informs us, an inordinate loving the creature, our selves, or the true God falsely, *Col. 3. 5. Rom. 3. 19. Eph. 5. 5.* therefore what cause Mr. *Allen* had for his



complaint, or Mr. Baxter upon his account, is submitted to the Reader.

But Mr. B. tells us that Mr. A. hath upon substantial Grounds altered his Judgment; intimating, that he has given divers Arguments for Infants-Baptism in his Book called, *a Perswasive to Unity*, and against seperation, in a Book called, *the Retraction of Seperation*, and which Mr. Baxter inlinuates are so strong, that none of the seperatists can confute, or stand before them; And which Mr. Allen himself calls upon us for some Answer to.

To which I say, that one reason why that book for Infants-Baptism, viz. the *Perswasive*, hath been the less regarded, is because it was not known to be Mr. Allens; he having set his name to those books that so firmly oppose it, but not to that which maintains it; the Author whereof till now having not been publickly known: and another reason why no more notice hath been taken of what is sayd about Infants-Baptism in that Book is, because it seems to be only a collection of some of those trite Arguments, in Mr B's writings, which Mr Tombes and others, nay Mr Allen himself hath so substantially refuted and baffled: The main Argument urged therein for its inforcement; is from their supposed mistake (as he saith) who conclude Infants-Baptism a nullity, as neither being Church Members nor included in Christs Commission, both which by quirks of wit, and by some Hypothetical Syllogismes he endeavors to make good; and by 4. Arguments from the Analogy,

Why the  
Perswasive  
was  
unanswer-  
d.

all the  
reasons  
not only  
but also

Analogy, that Circumcision hath to Baptism in some of the ends thereof, forgetting that he had before answered them all by such sound Arguments and Scripture-Authority, and not at all telling us, how we must reconcile what now he sayth, to avoyd the nullity, to what he before tells us for it: when he could neither finde matter or form in it, and which when he doth, we may have something to say to him; and therefore for the refreshing of his memory, I have by a Letter refer'd him to some of his own pages in those Writings for his better Information; Recommending Mr *Allen the Padobaptist*, to Mr *Allen the Anabaptist*, for his conviction: which he may reade with shame enough; And wicshall to prevent his boasting; have sent him an Answer from Mr *Tombes* to both his Books, viz. that of his *Retraction of separation*, and this of his *Perswasive*; the first intended to himself, the other to Dr *Connant* supposing him the Author of the latter; so far was the world from imagining it to be Mr *Allens*: Not doubting but Arguments from Mr *Tombes* who so much agrees with him in other things, may be more acceptable, then if they had come from some rigid Anabaptist.

Mr B's  
further  
plea for  
M. Allen.

As to what his Advocate Mr B. pleads on his behalf to undeceive some as he sayth, *who are apt to put an ill-construction upon M. Allens changing of his minde, as though he had turned with the times, and upon some worldly sinister account, to render thereby his example the less imitable, and his endeavours to draw off others the less successfull,* he

he witnesseth for him, that the alteration he made was the year before the King came in, &c.

To the which I say, how far carnal seat and worldly honour and Interest might influence that change, I shall not determine; but leave the matter to him that knows the secrets of hearts, and will judge righteously: only I must upon this occasion remember Mr Allen of a passage of his; in his Epistle to Mr Goodwin, before his *Baptismal abuses* (the Book we have been speaking of) treating so amply against Infants & for believers Baptism; applies to him in these following words, telling him, viz. The Nature of the subjects being such; as tends to perswade men to embrace that despised way which is generally every where spoken against. And which is apt to bring the assertors of it into disesteem and contempt among men, if not to expose them to sufferings of a worse Nature, the light whereunto, necessitates either to hazard much of our outward honour, peace and prosperity in the world, in following that light, or their inward peace and tranquillity in not obeying it. And as to the time (mentioned by Mr B.) it is well known that he had but half an eye who could not see such tryals were then coming upon us, to try our sincerity of that kinde. And some have been apt to fear that Mr B. himself was not without temptations of that kinde, in writing in that year so largely not only for a *Liturgy*, but for so many of the most *despicable* Ceremonies (as Dr. P. tells him) of the Church of England.

And as to Mr A's putgation in telling us what  
peace

peace he has had in that his alteration upon a sick bed, I say for my own part I shall not wonder that he who has stifled so much light, and cut the throat of such a witness he has so famously born for Christ against Antichrist; should be left in judgment to such a calm ( I say not, and the Lord grant it be not a hardned ) Conscience under it, And may not ( doth not Mr A. think ) many eminent professors who have turned *Papists*, *Quakers*, *Archiefs*, give us in the same experience? and will not that amount to as good a Vindication as his; which is submitted to the all-seeing God, and the word that must Judge us to determine.

And for a conclusion to this matter, we shall end with Mr Allens most solemn words to Mr Goodwin in that remarkable Epistle before mentioned, viz. *The day is now hastening apace wherein the mighty God will reckon with the Babylonish Whore for corrupting the Earth with her deceits, and then the eye of Jesus Christ will be upon those who have thoroughly pleaded his cause, wholly followed him, and faithfully born witness to his truth, against all his unsound and corrupt wayes; To keep them from the hour of Temptation that shall come upon all the World to try them; whereas those that have been partakers with her in her corruptions must then be partakers with her in her sufferings, though otherwise they be the people of God themselves, unless they have before that time obeyed that voice which sayeth, come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. And therefore upon the whole,*

whole, let the Reader judge, whether I deserved to have such a complaint made against me for saying, these following words, the passage reflected upon hereby, in the Postscript of 1. Ed. Treat. of Baptism, viz.

‘ And which Books, ( viz. Mr Allens, and Mr  
‘ Lambs Treat. for believers, and against Infants-  
‘ Baptism ) are done with that Judgment, strength  
‘ of Argument and Authority of Scripture, that  
‘ notwithstanding they have both of them personal-  
‘ ly declined those truths, so zealously and under-  
‘ standingly pleaded for by them, and are gone back  
‘ to that they therein call ( or if that like not dis-  
‘ cover to be ) humane Tradition, will-worship and  
‘ Idolatry, fulfilling Dan. 11. 35. Prov. 8. 4.  
‘ Gal. 2. 18. 2 Pet. 2. 21. 22. Yet will their books  
‘ not only live as a witness for God and his reproa-  
‘ ched truth, but as a living Testimony against  
‘ themselves, in their unreasonable, and unright-  
‘ eous departure from the same ( without repen-  
‘ tance ) to all generations.



*An Admonition to Mr. Baxter,*

S I R,

**T**Hat I have according to *your* admonition improved some time in secret seriously to consider those hainous crimes you laid to my charge; I hope the foregoing lines may be some witness for me to your owne Conscience and to all good men. It has I assure you been no small triall to me to finde a man so famed for learning and piety so pressing to peace and unity as your self; so to exceed the bounds of civillity, charity, and morallity, and give way to such a *Shimes* and *Rabsheke* spirit, and how I have improved your unchristian dealing for the benefit of my *soul*, and to pray for such a one that so despitefully useth and persecuteth me, is best known to him that knows all things. If I have in this my return (under your *highest provocations*) used too much sharpness at any time, I allow not my self in it; though you know some *are sharply to be reprov'd that they may be sound in the faith*: And you are pleased to tell us, that you stand in more need of faithfull reproofs, then your friends administer to you (and I think so too, or else it would not be so bad with you as it is:) your own words are these: 1 *Disp. 5. Sacram.* p. 487. *I confess my pride needs sharper reprehensions than friends have ever used about me; and therefore they are better from any body than from no body;* And therefore saith Dr. F. p. 164. of his *Append.*

*That*

That you had convinced him of the irrefragable Orthodoxy and truth of what you have there put up on record, telling you ( he did but echo your own words ) that he must cross his own inclinations and change his stile for no other end then to serve your needs ; For you gave it him under your hand, both that your malady is dangerous, and that it needs a rough cure, and that you are not like Alexanders Bucephalus to be subdued with soft usage.

Therefore Sir having made so good use of your Admonition, and reproofs, as to discharge my self of those Forgeries and immoralities charg'd upon me, getting the beam out of my own eye ; may with more freedom endeavour the getting the mote out of my Brothers eye : And you that with so much liberallity dispence your Admonitions to others, ought also as well to take them your self when they come to your turn.

You must therefore bear with me, if I do ( taking your own method ) beseech you when you are sometime alone to answer these following Questions seriously to your own conscience.

First, whether you that knew that *slaundering and false accusing your Neighbour is such a dreadful kind of folly and and displeasing to any but diabolical natures* so expressly reprov'd and threatned by Gods word ; which at large you have so excellently held forth in your *Christian Directory*, and whereof I have before given some small account from your own Pen, p. 158. ( and to which I refer you for the refreshing of your memory ) are you not much more inexcusable if you your self become guilty thereof, as saith the Apo'st

Slaunder  
and false  
accusatio  
on.

Rom. 2. 1, 2, 3. And whether you are not hainously guilty therein, let those 2. famous instances of your dealing with the *Anabaptists* and the *Vanists* determine in your Conscience : And to which may not I add for your better search into that matter, your late dealing with me, whilst you charge me to be so notoriously guilty of such *suspicious forgery, Prevarication, and falsehood*, yea, so to abound in *untruths, that scarce a line in my Book is free*, and yet not able to demonstrate the same in any one materiall thing, is it not worthy your Consideration, that you might the better know what spirit you are of, taking *Deut. 19. 18. Exod. 23. 1. Ps. 15. 3.* along with you ?

Railing  
and reviling  
language.

Secondly, whether you who so very well know that railing is so hainous a sin, which makes one so like the Devil, and so unlike God, and which is ranked with the highest immorallities, *1 Cor. 5. 10.* so expressly forbid *Tir. 3. 2. 1 Tim. 3. 3. Eph. 4. 31.* so dangerous to contract the guilt thereof, *Math. 5. 22.*

Yet whether in your writings you do not too much give way thereto, which others you know have much complained of, and of which I could give you some particular account. And whether the language yon have with so much freedom bestowed upon me is not of the same nature, I submit to your Conscience and the judicious Reader, and whereof I shall give you a few instances. For have not you told me, *That I am a non-conformist to truth, Christian duty and common honesty, one whom sense and truth hath forsaken,*

a John

a John Becal'd, a fabler, and slaunderer, a soul-troubling seducer, an Impudent hypocrite; rash calumniator, brazen-fac't lyer; distracted dotard, one fitter for Bedlam, then humane society; and that my falsehoods are bold fac't, rash, horrid, deliberate, concatenate, and not to be matcht with any falsifyer in the world, my forgeries strange, monstrous, sad, and morally gross; and my untruths of such a stupendious magnitude that might fright the conscience of a sober Turk, or make a Pagan to blush to be guilty of some of them; one of the bawling unclean [or smitten] Children, that defiles and disturbs the house, and much more of such dirty stuff. [And such an entertainment that I presume you never gave a red coat heretofore.]

But whether this way of treat proceeds from the wisdom that is from above, which is *pure, peaceable, gentle*? &c. or from that which is from beneath, from whence *envy, wrath, strife, sedition, &c.* proceeds, and which is *earthly, sensual, devilish*, James 3. 14. is left to your second thoughts and better consideration? And whether this is in meekness to instruct those that oppose? and to speak evil of no man? And with the tongue of the wise to use knowledge aright? and by a soft answer to turn away wrath? and to answer the Exhortation and command of letting all bitterness, wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking, be put away from you, with all malice, and to be kinde one to another, tenderhearted? or the contrary, is submitted to your conscience in the sight of God.

Notorious  
contra-  
dictions.

Thirdly, whether you that know, that contradiction is such a scandalous thing, so prejudicial to truth and reproachfull to the Gospel; to make the Trumpet sound uncertainly; to be yea and nay, backwards and forwards, off, and on, for, and against, and to be a weather-cock in religion, especially in the great poynts thereof, respecting faith and worship, the Doctrine & Discipline of Christ: yet whether you have not abounded therein? and are not notoriously guilty thereof? is by the several instances tendred you in the forgoing collection brought to your consideration?

Adding to  
and altering  
God's  
worship.

Fourthly, you that know how dangerous a thing it is, as you have worthily told us, from *Deut. 12. 32.* (as before remark't) to adde to things that God commanded us, respecting his worship, bespeaking men as you tell us arrogantly proud, pretending to be wiser then their maker, or redeemer, not only to equalize themselves with him, but exalt themselves above him, by correcting his Laws; and making better Laws and Orders for his Church than himself has done.

And yet whether you have not in your late writings, especially in your *Christian Directory* and *Cathol. Theology*, fully done the same thing; in many particulars, relating to the worship & service of Christ, is earnestly recommended to your conscience in the sight of God?

Proud dicta-  
torship.

Fifthly, whether you that at so high a rate condemn and censure proud Dogmatizers, and superstitious ones, Church-Tyrants, and Dictators, are not your self notoriously guilty of the same?



same? And do not your Writings abound in Dictatorship? and your severe censuring and judging of others that embrace not your sayings as Oracles, and magisterially too? that as Dr P. observes to you, that *there are no sort of Christians in the world you have not endeavoured to disgrace one time or other, and what a son of Ithmael you are who have your hand against every one and every ones hand against you*: Consider I beseech you, whether those 2 late passages favours not of great pride, which should be mortifyd in you: 1<sup>st</sup>, That in your Preface to *More Proofs*, viz. *A man may finde words at length to say for almost any cause*: I partly know what can be sayd against this and every Book that I have written, and I know what I can reply; and I partly fore-know what they can say to that reply, and what I can further say in defence of it: whether this very passage doth not bespeak much arrogancy? whereby you would be thought to be one of the greatest seers in the world? for I presume few men can say the like that hath written at that rate that you have done. And surely I am apt to believe and others it may be may be of my minde too, that if you had known what I should have answered, & conscious to your self that you had given so just occasion to me, you was neither friend to your self, peace of the Church, or the truth, to have written us such a Book, as well as others, that you have given us, that I could pick out of your great Catalogue, and some of which you tell as also you have recanted.

The other is that undesent passage, p. 213. viz.

S;

But

*But my purpose is to meddle with them but this once [ viz. The Anabaptists ] ( so that if Mr B. and Mr W's will but keep their words, it seems we are not any more to be troubled with them upon that subject ) : And if after this , these crying children will bawl and wrangle, and foul the house, and think that I am made for no better work, then either to rock the cradle , or to make them clean ; I will let them cry, and take their course [ and is not that spoke like a cruel step-father? what, let them lye in their filth, and spoyle themselves ] and will no more believe that their humors are the masters of my time : But who must then futor our Father, when in his drunken fits he so defiles himself, and makes such a noysom smell, and licks up his very vomit again.*

Forgery  
and abuse  
of Au-  
thors.

Sixthly, you that have so severely reprov'd blinde temerarious andacity for abusing and falsly, and forgedly, quoting of Authors ; and yet whether whilst you are administring your reproofs to others, you are not notoriously guilty thereof your self, of which take these few Instances of many, *viz.* 1st, For that most injurious fathering that most notorious popish confession out of *Wendover* upon the *Waldenses*, of which you only produce but part for *Infants-Baptism to save them* ( though you have so often acknowledg'd they disownd *Infants Baptism* to that end ) concealing in the mean time the rest of it, that you knew would detect the cheat, *viz.* For their Masse, popish priesthood, Real presence, penance, &c. and yet deal so severely with me for overlooking it, as p. 380. of your

Book.

Book. And which is fully detected by me, p. 84.

2ly, That I sayd, that *Bruno* Archbishop of *Triers* persecuted *Beringarius* for denying Infants-Baptism, and most sharply reprov'd me for the same, p. 377. when I sayd no such thing, as demonstrated to you before, p. 94. besides 6. or 7. absurdities and gross mistakes that you committed about the same, p. 96.

3dly, your notorious abuse of Dr *Prideaux*, and temerarious Oscitancy about the 2d. Lateran Council, respecting *Pct. Brunis* and *Arnoldus*, denying Infants-Baptism, p. 385. denying positively that there was the least proof of any such matter medled with in that Council, and that *Binius* tells us, that the Acts of that Council are not extant, and that *Otto Frisingensis* who gives some account of what was done therein about an Antipope; yet his words have not a syllable about any such subject; whereas, as I have before demonstrated, p. 98. That *Binius* doth expressly tell us, the acts of that Council, particularly mentions *Brunis* and *Arnolds* denying Infants-Baptism at that time, and records the Canon that judgd these that denyd Infants-Baptism; and expressly tells us, that *Otto Frisingensis* did record passages about *Arnolds* denying Infants-Baptism; and of his being dealt with in the Council about it.

4ly, Your most notorious abuse of *Wickliff*, in curtailing his words, in the 11. and 12. Chap. of his *Tryalog*. in mist-ranslating him, misrepresenting him quite contrary to his declared sense in several particulars, making him a very Pa-

pist in diverse things, which he so eminently witnessed against, as p. 535. and which is by me at large detected, p. 121, &c. But we shall repeat no more, the rest being before you.

Seventhly, Whether you have not so countenanced and abetted M.W's in all his gross miscarriages as to make them your own, not only by the high commendation of the eminent service you say he had done in detecting so fully my mistakes to merit the great thanks of the Church, but when his forgeries and mistakes were so evidently discovered by me, yet to endeavour as you have done to palliate and smother the same? And whether in like manner you have not so abetted Mr Allen in his injurious complaint, as to contract his guilt also, is submitted to your conscience, and how well such carriage comports with *Eph. 5. 11. have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness but reprove them rather, 1 Tim. 5. 22. Neither be partakers of other mens sins, keep thy self pure,* is left with you.

False worship and idolatry.

Eightly, Whether you that know, that Idolatry and false worship, which consists (as you have informed us) not only in worshipping false Gods, Images, and Idols, but the true God falsely, by altering, changing, or adding to his Laws of worship, and for which sin, God as a jealous God has been more severe in inflicting his judgments than in any other thing.

Yet who hath offered us more additions and alterations and new inventions in Gods worship, then yourself; who hath more struck at Reformation, more censured and disgraced all

the Conscientious contenders for it and friends of it whether Presbyterians, Independants, Anabaptists, &c. as giddy foolish sectaries, and sinful separatists then your self? nay, who hath more pull'd up the wall and hedge of separation, not only of the former, but even the Protestant pale it self? as Dr. Peirce tells you, *having vilified the Protestants of every sort and so make men run into Popery by way of refuge.*

And how favourably you have spoken of Popish doctrines, Ministry, discipline, to the disgrace of Protestantism, do not your late Books sadly witness and whereof I have given some little account; though your self also grant, what an Anti-christ, the Pope is, and what an Idolatrous strumpet that Romish false Church.

Thus Sir, I have done, concluding with your own words. *If pride, partiality, and passion, will not let your conscience work upon these things, but you will turn them into gall instead of Repentance; and come forth again, which I expect from you (notwithstanding your firm resolution to meddle no more with such bawling dirty brats) with greater rage & fury, your arrogant haughty spirit being not to be reacht with any of my corrosives, but excited and inflamed rather; I offer them to the consideration of others to prevent or remedy their infection: though with the hazard of name, reputation, and what not, in this faithful and plain hearted ingaging, with such a man of wrath and tongue, as you have discovered your self to be.*

And remember, *which you have told the world in print,*



print, that I did indeed send my Book-seller to you, in a friendly way, to have received your exceptions against my book, that I might have given you all fair and full satisfaction, and have prevented thereby all this mischief, and inconvenience, that has since occurred, which you utterly refused, and chose this way rather which you so much gloried in, p. 339. And with what daring challenges and menaces you draw forth the proof (of what is tendred you from your own writings) is not unknown to you.

It is Sir, your recovery and repentance I heartily and sincerely desire, and that instead of being such a disturber of the peace of the Church, as you have notoriously been (all parties being judge) fulfilling so eminently that prophecy (as said of Bishop *Usher*) your parts and abilities may yet be improved to the service of Christ; and of an ignorant *Saul* (as *Samuel Fisher* told you) who as concerning zeal yet persecutes the Church, and pours out reprobation upon them, you may become a seeing and preaching *Paul*, of the faith, doctrine, and discipline of Christ, that you have so much disgraced, and as much as in you is destroyed and laid waste.

---

## P O S T - S C R I P T.

*Some short Reflections upon Mr. Baxters Book, called More-Proofs, by John Tombes. B.D.*

**T**O what Mr. B. hath done in his *Preface* to Mr. *Wills* his book, and his *Christian Directory*; in my *Just Reply* is answer made; Besides those writings there is lately published his mock-titled virulent book *More Proofs of Infants Churchmembership*. The dispute at *Bewdly*, Jan. 1649. how insolently, injuriously, unbrotherly and unchristianly it was managed and published by him, my *Antidote Precursor*, and other writings shew. Infants rights and benefits conferred by the baptismal Covenant of grace are a meer *Chimera*: I challenge him to set down distinctly his *theses* concerning the grace he means, the covenant of grace, what and whose it is, how it is baptismal, what are the rights and benefits conferred to infants by it, using words in their proper sense and genuine notions, and then without questions, exclamations, flirts, suppositions unproved, set down his Scriptures, and form his arguments syllogistically, as that eminently learned man mentioned in my Epistle before my *Felo de se* required, and then I doubt not but learned and accurate disputants will see his folly, and finde his arguings frivolous; however superficial Schollars though godly, zealous preachers, and well affected Christians addicted to Mr. B. by reason of his preaching do esteem his opinion and writings

things about this point. That I printed Mr. B's letters without his consent, was most just, who printed most injuriously my answers in the Dispute at *Bewdly*, before I had revised them, though I sought it, and it was promised me, and had in print falsely blazed it abroad, that he had driven me to grosse absurdities in the dispute, which in his *peæfestinantis morator*, he passed over, when my *Precursor* had acquitted them from absurdity: and his printing my *Animadversions* on his *Aphorisms of Justification*, justify my printing his letters without his consent rightly, they being written vpon mature consideration; and it being by me intimated, that it was necessary I should know his meaning, when I examined his argument. But how ill he hath dealt with me may appear, 1. In his leaving out all these sections, 33. 34. 35. 49. 50. 51. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. of the third part of my *Review*, in which that which Mr. B. brings for his pretended infants visible Church-membership in the Church, Christian distinct from the Jewish, and their admission into it by vertue of Gods covenant, or law of nature, or parents, pro parents, or owners act of dedication, is fully examined 2. In his putting sect. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. before 52. which did syllogistically prove infants no visible Church-members. 3. In his leaving out many considerable passages in my answer to his letters, especially sect. 63. about his 10. calumnatory questions, imputing my answers to passion, and his reply needles, which I count necessary either

ther to bring me to repentance or himself for his uncharitableness towards me, who have not met with a man more uncharitable in his speeches of me, and more pertinacious therein.

4. In mistaking mine and his own words; which are sometimes non-sense, and sometimes cross to himself elsewhere. 5. In not giving answer to what he should, but putting it off with a scoff, and yet burdening or encumbering the dispute with many unnecessary questions, which is not answered, yet being his part to prove, he should have shewed his law and ordinance of infants visible Church-member-ship unrepealed, so as that they belonged to every Church of God, according to its constitution, Jewish or Christian, by Gods appointment: whereas he brings nothing but dictates, and his own perswasion, imagines the Christian Church as if it were by nature, the kingdom of Christ having infants as other kingdomes; whereas Christs Church was framed as a School by preaching, not as a Nation by birth or cohabitation, so manifestly contrary to all the ways of Christ, and his Apostles, and their relations: that I admire any that reads the New Testament, should not perceive the delusion with which he deceives himself and others. 6. As for his answers to my arguments, sect. 52. they are so slight and insufficient, that were it not my book is so big, and in the hands of so few, and so few either preachers or others are acquainted with University exercise of disputing, and Logick terms, I should judge it unnecessary to write any thing, to shew their insufficiency,

sufficiency. If readers of Mr. B. would compare my writings with his, and examine both without prejudice and partiality. And I mervail that Mr. Baxter should be so confident of his opinion, when he talks of the Covenant of God to the faithfull and their seed, which was not made with all *Abrahams* seed, *Rom. 9. 8. Gal. 3. 16.* that he should imagine parents relation, consent, or dedication should make an infant a visible Christian Church-member, without any visible note either of parents or children, whereas he himself often in his writings makes the profession of faith to be that which makes a visible Church-member; and there is no mark or sign of a visible Christian Church-member in a believers infant more then in an infidels, that he should imagine that a parents dedication should intitule to Baptism, which is only by institution, and is the only rule by which it is to be administered, that he should call that profession which is thus made a baptismal vow of the infant obliging it as his vow, that he should so continue to contradict himself as my *Felo de se* shews, and other writings, and yet never reconcile the passages, nor recant his palpable grosse false assertions of infants Church-membership and Baptism, that he should upon such vain pretences of want of time, of his greater business put off the examining of this great point of Christianity as it is reckoned, *Heb. 6. 2.* and censure others for their earnestness about it, though by solemn Covenant engaged to endeavour reformation in worship according to Gods word; I am bold to  
tell



tell him that his way of yielding so much as he doth to Papists and others, that erre, his making disputes in many points but Logomachies, his motions to peace with losse of truth, are such as are likely to make more breaches, and inconsistent with that sincerity, tenderneſs of conscience, love of truth, and zeal for Christ, which should be in all that are called by his name. And sixth Baptiſm is a most solemn ordinance, equal, if not of more importancee then the Lords Supper, to shew so much care for its right administration, and so little for the other, is a signe of hypocrisy, and makes liable to Gods judgment as well as the irregular administration of the Lords supper, 1 Cor. 11. 30. And I say, his quarrelling with me or Mr. *Danvers* about my Edition of my *Felo de se*, and mention of it, as it is vain, it having been just to shew his error, and to warn others of adhering to him in that point, so it is a signe of too much hardneſs of heart in him, that he doth so slightly put it off, and so pertinaciously retains and avoucheth that error, which his own writings refute.

---

FINIS.